IN THE PRESS.

I.

The PRINCIPLES of PHYSICAL, INTELLECTUAL, MORAL and RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. By W. NEWNHAM, Esq. Author of a "Tribute of Sympathy," &c. &c. 2 vols. 8vo.

II.

VALDENSIAN MISCELLANY; containing Historical Details of the Valdenses, in Piemont and other Countries. With abridged Translations of "l'Histoire des Vaudois," par Bresse and la Rentree Glorieuse, d'Henri Arnauld, with the Ancient Valdensian Catechism. To which are subjoined, Original Letters, written during a residence among the Vaudois of Piemont and Wirtemberg, in 1825.

III.

TYPICAL INSTRUCTION CONSIDERED and ILLUSTRATED, and shewn to be directed to all, but particularly the Early Ages of the Church.

IV.

A SECOND VOLUME of SERMONS, by the Hon. and Rev. G. T. NOEL, M.A.

V.

MICHAEL the MARRIED MAN. In 2 parts. Being a Continuation of MICHAEL KEMP.

SHADES of CHARACTER, or the Infant Pilgrim, By the Author of "The History of Michael Kemp." *New Edition.*

VI.

The BURIAL and RESURRECTION of CHRIST, according to the Four Evangelists, from the German of JOHN DAVID MICHAELIS, formerly Professor of Philosophy, at Gottingen. 1 vol. 12mo.

VII.

A SKETCH of MY FRIEND'S FAMILY, intended to suggest some Practical Hints on Religion and Domestic Manners. By Mrs. MARSHALL, "Author of Henwick Tales." *New Edition.* 18mo.

VIII.

A VOLUME of SERMONS, by the Rev. W. DEALTRY, Rector of Clapham.

IX.

The ARRANGEMENT of BRITISH PLANTS. By WILLIAM WITHERING, edited and enlarged by his SON. A new Edition in 8vo.

X.

The HISTORY of MODERN EUROPE, with a Continuation to the Peace of Paris in 1815. By Dr. CHARLES COOTE. A new Edition.

XI.

The FAMILY EXPOSITOR. By PHILIP DODDRIDGE, D.D. A new Edition in 6 vol. 8vo.

HUMAN SACRIFICES IN INDIA.

SUBSTANCE

OF

THE SPEECH

OF

JOHN POYNDER, ESQ.

AT THE COURTS

OF

PROPRIETORS OF EAST INDIA STOCK,

HELD ON THE

21st and 28th Days of March, 1827.

"AT THE HAND OF EVERY MAN'S BROTHER WILL I REQUIRE THE LIFE "OF MAN."—Gen. ix. 5.

"IF THOU FORBEAR TO DELIVER THEM THAT ARE DRAWN UNTO "DEATH, AND THOSE THAT ARE READY TO BE SLAIN;

"IF THOU SAYEST, BEHOLD, WE KNEW IT NOT; DOTH NOT HE THAT "PONDERETH THE HEART CONSIDER IT? AND HE THAT KEEPETH THY "SOUL, DOTH NOT HE KNOW IT? AND SHALL NOT HE RENDER TO "EVERY MAN ACCORDING TO HIS WORKS?—Prov. xxiv. 11, 12,

---

LONDON:
J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.
1827.

LONDON :
IBOTSON AND PALMER, PRINTERS, SAVOY STREET, STRAND.

PREFACE.

The following is a copy of the Resolution, (moved by Mr. POYNDER, and seconded by SIR CHARLES FORBES,) which it was the object of the Address now presented to the Public, to advocate, viz.—

"That this Court, taking into consideration the "continuance of Human Sacrifices in India, "is of opinion that, in the case of all Rites, "or Ceremonies, involving the destruction of "Life, it is the duty of a Paternal Govern- "ment to interpose for their prevention; and "therefore recommends to the Honourable "Court of Directors to transmit such Instruc- "tions to India, as that Court may deem most "expedient for accomplishing this object, con- "sistently with all practicable attention to the "feelings of the Natives."

In an early stage of the Second day's discussion, the Hon. Chairman, SIR G. A. ROBINSON,

proposed an Amendment, which was seconded by the Deputy Chairman, the Hon. HUGH LINDSAY, of which the following is a copy, viz.—

"That whilst this Court deeply deplores the existence of Suttees, and other Rites involving the Sacrifice of human life in India, it reposes the fullest confidence in the *anxious disposition of the local Government*, to give effect to the Instructions of the Court of Directors, by adopting, from time to time, such measures *as in their judgment can be safely and most effectually applied to the abolition* of these barbarous and inhuman customs; and this Court is firmly persuaded that it will *continue to be* an object of earnest solicitude with the Court of Directors, to promote its attainment, with a due regard to the feelings and prejudices of the Native Subjects."

The above Amendment was subsequently withdrawn by the Chairman, and the Deputy Chairman; and the Resolution which had been first proposed, was carried in its stead, by a decided Majority—only Five Proprietors dividing against it—Four of whom were Directors.

It may be proper to observe, that as a condition for withdrawing the Amendment, the Hon. Chairman, in the first instance, required a declaration from those Proprietors who advocated the

original Resolution, that such Resolution did not contemplate the adoption of compulsory measures; to which they replied, that, however opposed they unfeignedly felt to the employment of force at the present time, as believing it to be wholly unnecessary, it was impossible that they could give any pledge of that description, with reference to the future; in addition to which, the equivocal nature of the condition proposed to them must necessarily preclude a compliance with it, inasmuch as some persons might consider as "the employment of force," the half yearly attendance of the Military at Saugor, under which, the Sacrifice of Children there, has been notoriously prevented, from the administration of Lord Wellesley, down to the present time—a measure, the wisdom and expediency of which, it was presumed that no one, even among the Directors themselves, could now desire to call in question. Under these circumstances, the Resolution in question eventually passed in the affirmative, after having received the valuable support of several Proprietors, among whom, the Publisher feels it impossible to omit the expression—he will not say, of his gratitude, but—of the grateful feelings of every friend of our common Nature, to Randle Jackson, Esq., in whose eloquent and convincing Appeal, it was not easy to pronounce, whether the sound principles of National Law, or the legitimate rights of a suffering Empire, were urged with most effect on the attention of his Hearers.

The occasion of the present Publication arises from the circumstance of many Proprietors, and other Persons, having considered that the mass of Evidence thus collected from voluminous Parliamentary Papers, which are not accessible to all, even of the Proprietors themselves, ought to be placed within the reach of every one who may feel disposed to consult it. The Editor had the less hesitation in yielding to their request, as it appeared to him only due to the honourable testimony borne by so many Residents in India, to the guilt of blood, and the practicability of its removal, that the Proprietors and the Public should be apprized of the noble stand which has been made by such Men, against the unnecessary abominations by which they have been surrounded; and no less due to those enlightened Individuals in the British Parliament, to whose humane interference we owe the production of all the information we possess, that their exertions should be also commended to the gratitude of the East India Company, and of the Nation.*

With respect to the part taken by the Mover, he desires thus publicly to acknowledge, that if any consequences shall follow his humble efforts,

* In the first rank of those who are here referred to, may be classed the name of T. F. Buxton, Esq., the Member for Weymouth, "whose high and honourable character," (to quote the language of Mr. R. Jackson,) "and the eminent degree in which "he possesses the confidence of the House of Commons, has given "strength to his generous and virtuous exertions."

which may conduce to the glory of God, and the interests of Humanity, he wishes altogether to refer such a result, as well as all the aid, of whatever nature, which he has received in advocating this cause, to Him "from whom," to use the language of Scripture, "cometh every good and "every perfect gift;" or, to adopt the Scriptural phraseology of the Church of England, "by whose "holy inspiration we think those things that are "good, and by whose merciful guidance we per-"form the same."

SPEECH,

&c.

Mr. Chairman,

I hope I shall not be charged with undue presumption in venturing upon a subject of so much difficulty and delicacy as the present, when I assure the Court that it arises from no fault of mine that the motion which I have the honor to submit, is not in better and abler hands; and I speak in the presence of those who know that it has long been my object and desire that others, who would have done it ampler justice, should rather have had the charge of it than myself, under whom I should have esteemed it an honor to have acted. It has so happened, however, that one friend who stood pledged upon this subject, has been removed by death, another has departed to a distant duty, and such as remain, have, from one cause or another, finally left the matter in the hands in which it at present rests. Under these circumstances, I have only to throw myself upon the candour and kindness of the Court. I feel in unfeigned need of such indulgence, not only on my own account personally, but because, since the very nature of my subject renders it necessary that I should rather

produce the opinions of competent witnesses upon such a question, (by which alone it ought to be decided,) than bring before the Court any conclusion of my own, there may possibly be found some documentary references likely to prove less interesting: I intreat, therefore, a patient hearing, and that, whatever may be the result, I may be indulged with the attention of the Court to the evidence I shall produce.

It is now about ten years since, that a man who had been much in India, and to whom India is under no small obligations, brought before the British public an account of the immolation of a very aged female near Calcutta, which sacrifice was, however, devoid of any circumstances of peculiar atrocity, and entirely within the limits of the present Prohibitory Regulations; and he says, "In a discussion which this event produced in "Calcutta, it was asked who was guilty of the "blood of this woman? The government in India "was exculpated on the ground that the govern-"ment at home never sent instructions on the sub-"ject; and the Court of Directors were exculpat-"ed, because they were the agents of others. It "remained that *the Proprietors of India Stock*, "who originate and sanction all proceedings of "the Court of Directors, were remotely accessary "to the deed. The best vindication of the great "body of Proprietors is this, that some of them "never heard of the female sacrifice at all; and "that few of them are acquainted with the full ex-

"tent and frequency of the crime." And then, after some other remarks, he asks, "Have the Pro-"prietors of India Stock at any time instructed the "Court of Directors to attend to a point of so "much consequence to the character of the Com-"pany, and the honor of the nation?" Now, looking at the time when this statement was published, I confess that, as a Proprietor, I feel unwilling to plead guilty to this inquiry, as involving any charge of criminal negligence, because, at that period, the Parliamentary papers now before the public had not been called for, and I apprehend that any Proprietor would have wanted sufficient materials on which to institute inquiry, or to found instructions. That want can however be now no longer complained of, and should this Court now observe silence, it will, I apprehend, be incurring a terrible responsibility.

These Parliamentary papers have been now printed by order of the House of Commons, at six different periods, the four first parts comprizing nine years detailed Returns of the Burning of Widows, viz. from the year 1815 to 1823 inclusive, together with a large portion of the most valuable communications and correspondence; the fifth part containing statements and correspondence on the practice of Infanticide; and the sixth being little more than a summary of the detailed Returns of Suttees.

The last of these, may, perhaps, be more conveniently referred to, in the first instance, and it

appears from it, that in the Presidency of Bengal alone, there were burnt alive in the years

1815	1816	1817	1818	1819	1820	1821	1822	1823
378	442	707	839	650	597	654	583	575

These numbers laid together form a total in the single Presidency of Bengal in nine years of - - - - 5425

In 8 years, in Fort St. George, of - - - - 287

In 9 years, in Bombay, of - - - - - 248

5960

There being no Returns for Tanjore for the six years from 1814 to 1819 (inclusive) I have taken as the lowest possible estimate for the whole of these six years } 40*

Which will form a total of 9 years for the three Presidencies, of - - - - - - - - - 6000

of which 5425 were in the Presidency of Bengal alone.

The number of children of various ages which I estimate as having been left by the only surviving parent, in the Presidency of Bengal only, omitting entirely the two other Presidencies, will have amounted to 5128 in nine years.

In endeavouring to advocate the motion which I have submitted, I beg to solicit the attention of my brother Proprietors to two leading points, because to one or the other of these, I believe it will be found that every observation which I shall adduce may be referred.

The first is—ENOUGH HAS NOT BEEN DONE BY THE GOVERNMENT AT HOME AND ABROAD TOWARDS THE SUPPRESSION OF THIS PRACTICE.

* 17 per Annum returned in 1820 would be for the six years not returned, 102; but I have taken the low amount of 40 for that whole period, as desiring to be within the limits in a doubtful case

The second is—THAT MORE MAY NOW BE DONE WITH THE MOST PERFECT SECURITY TO OUR INDIAN EMPIRE.

And it is only as I may be enabled to establish these two points to the satisfaction of the Court, that I shall consider myself entitled to ask their support of my motion.

Every Proprietor who hears me is aware, that on the death of the Hindoos, it is the practice for some widows (for it is by no means general) after the performance of certain ceremonies in which the Brahmins or priests are necessary parties, to offer themselves as victims to be consumed with the dead body of the husband, but as every Proprietor may not have seen an account of the manner of the performance of this rite, I cannot do better than quote the description given by Sir Charles Malet, in the first page of the Parliamentary papers.

An account of the performance of the Rite occurs in the first page of the Parliamentary papers, in a letter from Sir Chas. Malet, resident at Poonah, dated 18th of June, 1787, which may afford a specimen of the ordinary ceremony, when not attended by any extraordinary cruelties. After detailing the preparations, among which the principal was, that she distributed among the Brahmins 2000 rupees, and the jewels with which she was decorated; which will sufficiently account for the performance taking place at all, Sir Charles proceeds.—"Now, with "her hands indeed held up to heaven, but with her "poor eyes cast in a gaze of total abstraction, "deep into the den of anguish that awaited her,

" she stopped awhile, a piteous statue! At length, " without altering a feature, or the least agitation " of her frame, she ascended by the door way, and " lying down beside her husband's corpse, gave " herself, in the meridian of life and beauty, a vic- " tim to a barbarous and cruelly consecrated error " of misguided faith. As soon as she entered, she " was hid from our view by bundles of straw, with " which the aperture was closed up; and all the " actors in this tragic scene, seemed to vie with " each other who should be most forward in hurry- " ing it to a conclusion. At once, some darkened " the air with a cloud of goolol; some darting their " hatchets at the suspending cords, felled the laden " roof upon her; and others rushed eagerly for- " ward to apply the fatal torch. Happily, in this " moment of insufferable agony, when the mind " must have lost its dominion, and the ear expected " to be pierced with the unavailing cries of nature, " the welcome din of the trumpet broke forth from " every quarter.

[' First, Moloch, horrid king! besmeared with blood
' Of human sacrifice, and parent's tears;
' Tho' for *the noise of drums and timbrels loud*,
' Their children's cries *unheard*, that past thro' fire
' To his grim idol.'——MILTON.]

" A little girl, about four years of age, the fruit " of the union, survives them. The mother was " nineteen;—her stature was above the middle " standard;—her form elegant, and her features " interesting and expressive;—her eyes in particu- " lar, large, bold, and commanding. At the solemn

" moment in which alone I saw her, these beauties " were conspicuous, notwithstanding her face was " discoloured with turmeric, her hair dishevelled, " and wildly adorned with flowers; and her looks, " as they forcibly struck me throughout the cere- " mony, like those of one whose senses wandered." Vol. 1. p. 1.*

This was before the government's interference; but a second instance is mentioned by Mr. Bird, the Magistrate of Ghazeepore, in 1817.

" If it were desired," says he, " to pourtray a " scene which would thrill with horror every heart, " not entirely dead to the touch of human sympathy, " it would suffice to describe a father, regardless of " the affection of his tender child, in having already " suffered one of the severest miseries, with tearless " eye, leading her forth a spectacle to the assembled " multitude, who, with barbarous cries, demand " the sacrifice; and unrelentingly delivering up the " unconscious and unresisting victim to an untimely " death, accompanied by the most cruel tortures." Vol. 1. p. 136.

The following case may afford a specimen of the rite, when attended with circumstances of violence and coercion, of which too many, equally afflicting, occur in the Parliamentary papers. It has already been before the public, and is related on the testimony of Dr. Marshman, an unexceptionable living witness..

" *January* 9, 1807.

" A person informing us that a woman was

* The references are to the six volumes of the Parliamentary Papers.

" about to be burnt with the corpse of her husband,
" near our house, I, with several others, hastened
" to the place; but, before we could arrive, the pile
" was in flames. It was a horrible sight;—the most
" shocking indifference and levity appeared among
" those who were present. I never saw any thing
" more brutal than their behaviour. The dreadful
" scene had not the least appearance of a religious
" ceremony. It resembled an abandoned rabble of
" boys in England, collected for the purpose of
" worrying to death, a cat or dog. A bamboo, per-
" haps twenty feet long, had been fastened at one
" end to a stake driven into the ground, and held
" down over the fire by men at the other. Such
" were the confusion, the levity, the burst of brutal
" laughter, while the poor woman was burning alive
" before their eyes, that it seemed as if every spark
" of humanity was extinguished by this accursed
" superstition. That which added to the cruelty,
" was, the smallness of the fire. It did not consist
" of so much wood as we consume in dressing a
" dinner—no, not this fire that was to consume
" the living and the dead! I saw the legs of the
" poor creature hanging out of the fire, while her
" body was in flames. After a while, they took a
" bamboo, ten or twelve feet long, and stirred it,
" pushing and beating the half consumed corpses as
" you would repair a fire of green wood, by throw-
" ing the unconsumed pieces into the middle. Per-
" ceiving the legs hanging out, they beat them with
" the bamboo for some time, in order to break the
" ligatures which fastened them at the knees; (for

" they would not have come near to touch them for " the world.) At length they succeeded in bending " them upwards into the fire, the skin and muscles " giving way, and discovering the knee sockets " bare, with the balls of the leg bones; a sight this, " which, I need not say, made me thrill with horror, " especially when I recollected that this hapless " victim of superstition was alive but a few minutes " before. To have seen savage wolves thus tearing " a human body limb from limb, would have been " shocking; but to see relations and neighbours do " this to one with whom they had familiarly con- " versed not an hour before, and to do it with an " air of levity, was almost too much for me to " bear.

" You expect, perhaps, to hear, that this un- " happy victim was the wife of some Brahmin of " high caste. She was the wife of a barber, who " dwelt in Serampore, and had died that morning, " leaving the son I have mentioned, and a daughter " of about eleven years of age. Thus has this " infernal superstition aggravated the common mise- " ries of life, and left these children stripped of both " their parents in one day. Nor is this an uncommon " case. It often happens to children far more help- " less than these; sometimes to children possessed " of property, which is then left, as well as them- " selves, to the mercy of those who have decoyed " their mother to their father's funeral pile!"

It is impossible but that great disgust and horror must be felt at this recital; but Mr. Fox once said, " True humanity consists not in a squeamish

" ear, but in feeling for the sufferings of others, and " being forward and active in relieving them."

In further proof that any other feelings than those of religion characterize the rite, we may again refer to the Parliamentary papers. In a case there detailed in the Reports of 1815, it is stated that all of the deceased's caste came as to an entertainment, and that previous to his death, the husband was under the influence of liquor, while after it, his wife danced and sung.

Mr. Ewer, the acting superintendant of police in the Lower Provinces, in his appeal to the Governor General in Council, dated Calcutta, 18th November, 1818, says of these rites—

" Her relations, her attendants, and the sur-
" rounding crowd—men, women, and children, will
" be seen to wear one face of merriment, which in
" our days attends a boxing match or a bull-bait.
" The crowd assemble to see a show, which in their
" estimation affords more amusement than any other
" public exhibition with which they are acquainted;
" and the sacrifice is completed because the family
" is anxious to get rid of an incumbrance, and the
" Brahmins desirous of a feast and a present."

I therefore submit that the practice has little or no connection with their religion; and in further proof that interested motives alone operate in inducing the act, I may refer to the following appeal made to the Governor General in Council, by Mr. Ewer, acting superintendant of police in the Lower Provinces, dated Calcutta, 18th Nov. 1818:—

" Her relations are directly interested in her

" death. If she had a son, he may perhaps wish to " be relieved from the expense of maintaining a mo- " ther, and the trouble of listening to her unseason- " able advice. If she has none, her husband's male " relations will take care that she stand not in their " way, by claiming his estate for life, which is her " legal right. The Brahmins are paid for their ser- " vices, and are of course interested.

" If the relations chance to bestow a thought on " the consequences of the sacrifice, it will be di- " rected to the benefit which may thereby accrue to " themselves in this world or the next. The future " happiness of the sufferer and her deceased hus- " band is much too disinterested a consideration to " deserve one thought."—Vol. 1. p. 227.

In proof of the extreme cruelty of the act, I will read an extract of a letter addressed to me by one of the civil servants of the East India Company:—

" I have myself known children of eleven years " old burnt, for marriage being solemnized at the " age of five or six, amongst the opulent natives, " and the child being termed a wife from that pe- " riod, though she does not quit her parents' roof " till the age of maturity, she is liable to be sacri- " ficed at her husband's funeral."

With regard to the frauds of the Brahmins, it appears from answers of the Bombay Pundits, that the victim, before the sacrifice, makes an offering of a cow, or the value of one, to a Brahmin, for the purpose of his propitiating the gods, and prevailing on them to render the sacrifice *free from pain.*—Vol. 4. p. 199.

And as to the power of the Brahmins over the wishes of female relations, the acting magistrate of Midnapore, writing to Sir John Shore, Governor General of Fort William, 17th May, 1797, says of one intended sacrifice—"She is scarcely nine years "of age; her aunt used her endeavours to dissuade "her from the act, but the higher order of Brahmins "have filled her head with such notions of its pro- "priety, that I fear it will be accomplished."—Vol. 1. p. 23.

Repeated evidence occurs in innumerable instances in all the nine years of the detailed returns, printed by Parliament, of the unavailing efforts of female relations to dissuade, and the invariable success of the Brahmins, to induce the ceremony.

From the establishment of the British power in India, nothing was attempted by the Government there, in the way of interference, until the year 1805. On the 5th February of that year, when the members of Council consisted of Lord Wellesley, Lord Lake, Sir George Barlow, and Mr. Udney, the Governor General in Council addressed the Law Court of the Nizamut Adawlut, by a letter of that date*, in which it is expressly stated to be "one of the fundamental maxims of the British

* It is somewhat remarkable, that the only reason assigned for the Supreme Government being moved to write this letter was a case of immolation having occurred at Behar, in which the magistrate had without difficulty, on his own authority, prevented a female of twelve years old, in a state of intoxication, from being burnt, after which, he says, "the girl and her friends were extremely grateful for my interposition."—Vol. 1. p. 23.

"Government to *consult the religious opinions, "customs, and prejudices of the natives, in all "cases in which it has been practicable,* CONSIST- "ENTLY WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF MORALITY, REASON, "AND HUMANITY;" after which, the Governor General in Council adds, that he "considers it to be "an indispensable duty to ascertain whether this "unnatural and inhuman custom can be abolished "altogether;" and desires they will "ascertain how "far the practice is founded on the religious opi- "nions of the Hindoos. If not grounded in any "precept of their law, the Governor General in "Council hopes that the custom may gradually, if "not immediately, be altogether abolished. If, "however, the entire abolition should appear to the "Court to be impracticable in itself, or inexpedi- "ent, as offending any established religious opinion "of the Hindoos," then the Court are desired to "consider the best means of preventing the abuses;" among which, are noticed the administering of intoxicating drugs, and sacrifices at immature age. Now, taking this letter as a whole, nothing can be clearer than that Marquis Wellesley and his Council intended, throughout, that the toleration even of "religious opinions, customs, and prejudices," (I quote their own words) could only be permitted when they should be (again I quote them) "in con- "sistency with the principles of Morality, Reason, "and Humanity."

I apprehend this to be clearly a sound and legi- "e principle of legislation, for which the Su-

preme Government had the sanction of no less authority than Mr. LOCKE, which has never yet been attempted to be controverted. HE says, "The "magistrate ought not to forbid the preaching, or "professing of any speculative opinions, because "they have no relation to the civil rights of the "subject, nor do they break the public peace of So- "cieties. The post of a magistrate is only to take "care that the commonwealth receive no prejudice, "and that there be no injury done to any one in "*life* and estate. You will say, if some have a "mind to sacrifice infants, or practice *any other* "*such heinous enormities,* is the magistrate ob- "liged to tolerate them, because they are com- "mitted in a religious assembly?—I answer, No. "They are not lawful in the ordinary course of "life, nor in any private house, and, therefore, "neither are they so in the worship of God."

And again.—"I say no opinions contrary to "human society, or to those moral rules which are "necessary to the preservation of civil society, are "to be tolerated by the magistrate."

Now, Sir, upon this principle precisely is the letter of Lord Wellesley, and his Council, founded; —a principle only to be shaken when the primitive elements of society shall sustain an overthrow, but not before; for, according to the principle of all natural law, and of our own in particular, "*Jura Naturæ immutabilia sunt.*" The letter recognizes the amplest toleration, so far as is consistent with "the principles of Morality, Reason, and Humanity,"

but no further; and it affords a complete answer to all those who argue that we cannot act as we are required, because we have made a treaty, or compact, with India to respect her religion. We have indeed, made a treaty, but not in defiance of the law of nature;—we have entered into a compact, but not with crime and bloodshed—not at the price of life, nor amidst the groans and sufferings of our common humanity. The moment a purely religious rite infringes upon the laws of society, its character is changed, and it becomes a civil crime.

I contend, therefore, that we are not bound hand and foot by any supposed compact, which is in conflict with principles as old as the creation itself, and the obligation of which principles had force long antecedent even to the moral law; and, perhaps, a remark of Colonel Walker, in the Parliamentary papers, (who will be noticed hereafter,) will illustrate this part of my subject, when he says, "When the customs and rites of any "people are harmless, whatever form they assume, "and from whatever source they may be derived, "they are entitled to toleration and protection; but "they ought to be punished or amended, when their "evident tendency is to diminish population, and to "alienate the natural affections of mankind."—Vol. 5, p. 31.

Under this letter of Lord Wellesley, and his Council, a reference took place by the Legal Court, to the Pundits, as to the authority for the rite;

with whose detailed opinions it is not my intention to trouble the Court, but merely with the *result*, which is, that even they—the heathen interpreters of heathen laws—do not hold the practice to be any where *commanded* or *prescribed* by their sacred law, but only *permitted* by it. The distinct answer by them to the simple question—"whether a "woman is *enjoined* by the Shaster voluntarily to "burn herself with the body of her husband?" being —"Every woman of the four Castes is *permitted* "to burn herself," (except in certain cases then enumerated;) and they cite the authority of their principal Legislator MENU, who clearly discountenances the practice, declaring, that "a virtuous "wife ascends to heaven, if, *after the decease of her* "*Lord*, she devotes herself to pious austerities."*

* In conformity with this authority are the following equally strong opinions:—

"In childhood, a female must be dependant on her father;—in youth, on her husband;—*her lord being dead*, on her sons;—if she have no sons, on the near kinsmen of her husband."—Ordinances of MENU, translated by SIR W. JONES.

In addition to this, the head Jurist of the College of Fort William, and the Supreme Court, (Mrityoorjuya,) has given it as his opinion, that a life of mortification is the law for a widow. That, in former ages, nothing was ever heard of the practice, it being only peculiar to a later and more corrupt æra; and that a woman's burning herself from the desire of connubial bliss, ought certainly to be rejected with abhorrence. And he argues further, that burning being at best only an alternative for mortification, no alternative can have the force of direct law.—See his opinion, drawn up at the desire of the Chief Judge of the

If, indeed, the Pundits had been far more decided in their opinion, and had held the practice to be a constituent and integral part of their religion, (which they no where do,) still, an attention to the fundamental principle laid down by Lord Wellesley, and his Council, of only "consulting religious opinions, "customs, and prejudices, when consistent with "Morality, Reason, and Humanity," would effectually have prevented the sanction of the Government from being given. Let us however inquire what really did take place. The opinions of the Pundits were transmitted by the Legal Court of Nizamut Adawlut, to the Governor General in Council, on the 5th of June, 1805, then composed of precisely the same Members as on the 5th of February preceding; and the Legal Court accompanied the Pundits' opinions by a letter from themselves, dated the 5th of June, 1805, in which they say, they "apprehend it would be impracticable at the pre-"sent time consistently with the *principles* invari-

Sudder Dewannee Adawlut, in the periodical work, entitled the Friend of India.—Vol. 1. p. 310.

And in further proof that MENU is decidedly in favour of the widow's living, may be quoted his own injunction from Sir W. Jones's translation of his Institutes, p. 143.—"Let her emaciate her body by living voluntarily on pure flowers, roots, and fruits; but let her not, when her lord is deceased, even pronounce the name of another man. *Let her continue, till death,* forgiving all injuries, performing harsh duties, avoiding every sensual pleasure, and cheerfully practising the incomparable rules of virtue, which have been followed by such women as were devoted to one husband."

" ably observed by the British Government, of *ma-*
" *nifesting every possible indulgence to the reli-*
" *gious opinions and prejudices of the Natives,* to
" abolish the custom in question." " It appears,
" however, to the Court, that hope may be reason-
" ably entertained that this very desirable object
" may be gradually effected, and at no distant pe-
" riod of time. With this view, and for the pur-
" pose of preventing illegal, unwarrantable, and
" criminal practices,"—they then proceed to pro-
pose, for the sanction of the Supreme Government,
several prohibitory regulations affecting those Sut-
tees which are supposed to be not in conformity
with the Hindoos' own religion.

It is remarkable here, that the Legal Court, in this reply to the letter of the Governor General in Council, of the 5th of February preceding, entirely omit the important distinction then laid down by the Supreme Government as fundamental: namely, that Toleration must consist with " the prin-
" ciples of Morality, Reason, and Humanity;" and they state a *different* basis of action, which is untenable and inadmissible; for they here assert it to be " a principle invariably observed by the
" British Government, to manifest every possible
" indulgence to the religious opinions and prejudices
" of the Natives"—a canon of legislation absolutely distinct from, and opposed to, the rule of the Governor General in Council, as stated in his letter of the 5th of February preceding, and under which new and unsound view of the duty of Go-

vernment, it will be seen that the indulgence claimed for the Natives, might be extended to the toleration of the grossest possible outrages against humanity for all future time, inasmuch as it is not limited in its extent by any reference to the fundamental principles of "Morality, Reason, or Humanity."

Lord Wellesley's Government accordingly did nothing whatever, on this judicial recommendation that they should adopt the Prohibitory Regulations, and, indeed, it is understood that something more than the *negative* testimony of Lord Wellesley against this detestable practice characterized the concluding acts of that Nobleman's administration.

The Marquis Wellesley was succeeded by the Marquis Cornwallis, who, however, in like manner, did nothing, on the recommendation of the legal Court. Lord Cornwallis was succeeded by Sir George Barlow, who equally omitted to accede to the recommendation. Sir George Barlow was succeeded by Lord Minto, when on the 3d Sept. 1812, after more than seven years and an half had transpired from the first recommendation, and when not only the Marquis Wellesley who was Governor in Chief, in June 1805, but when every individual member of that Government had been changed [the supreme Court now consisting of *Lord Minto, Sir George Hewitt, Mr. Lumsden* and *Mr. Colebrooke*] the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, by their letter dated 3d September, 1812, forwarded to the Supreme Government the letter

of a Magistrate who had recently applied for Instructions for his guidance, and the Legal Court then remind such new Government of the letter of the Governor-General in Council [Marquis Wellesley] dated the 5th Feb. 1805—of their consequent reference to the Pundits—and of the Prohibitory Regulations then proposed by them to be adopted, but which had never to that hour been sanctioned by Lord Wellesley's, or by any succeeding Government. Upon this, Lord Minto, the Governor-General in Council, replies, under date of 5th Dec. 1812, observing that "it is *a fundamental prin-* "*ciple of the British Government to allow the most* "*complete toleration in matters of religion to all* "*classes of its native subjects;*" but his Lordship very remarkably omits the former limitation of the Marquis Wellesley, his predecessor, namely "in "all cases practicable, consistently with the prin- "ciples of Morality, Reason and Humanity;"—and, after noticing the opinions of the Pundits, that the woman is "*permitted* to burn herself," and "that "the performance will contribute essentially both to "her own happiness and that of her husband in a "future state;" it is added, "The practice, gene- "rally speaking, being thus *recognized and encou-* "*raged* by the doctrines of the Hindoo religion," [it being as clearly only *permitted* by them] "it ap- "pears evident that the course which the British "Government should follow, according to the prin- "ciple of religious toleration *already noticed,*" [that being, as we have seen, a distinct principle from the Marquis Wellesley's] "is to ALLOW the prac-

" tice in those cases in which it is countenanced by " their religion, and to prevent it in others, in which " it is by the same authority prohibited," as in the cases of

1st. Compulsion.

2d. Obtaining the woman's assent to the sacrifice by administering intoxicating drugs.

3d. Non-Age [the proper term of years for performing the sacrifice, being to be ascertained from the Pundits, and which is subsequently reported to be 16.]

4th. Pregnancy.

The Governor-General in Council then states, that the measures already proposed by the Court of Nizamut Adawlut appear well adapted to the purpose, (tho' upwards of seven years and an half had now elapsed without their adoption,) and these measures are---that the Magistrates should direct the Police officers to obtain the earliest information of an intended sacrifice, and such officers were then either to attend, or depute an officer under them to ascertain the circumstances, and if within the prohibited rules, the officer was to take the necessary measures to prevent the women being burned, apprizing the relations or others concerned that they would be dealt with as criminals if they proceeded, and the officers were directed to report monthly to the Magistrate every case and its circumstances.

In October, 1813, a woman having been burnt in the Burdwan District of Bengal, who had a child

of two years and an half old, the Magistrate requested instructions, and was answered by the Legal Court of Nizamut Adawlut, on the 9th Dec. 1813, that they did not intend to authorize the police to interfere in such a case, and they required him to issue the strictest injunctions against such interference for the future. On this, he remonstrated (18th December, 1813) and stated, that no fewer than four women had, in the six months since the Regulations had been in force, been actually prevented from burning, on the sole ground of their having infant children, and he intreated the Court to reconsider their order, under which, they again consulted the Pundits, as usual, and discovered that a woman having a child under three years of age might not burn *unless some one would agree to maintain the child,* in consequence of which opinion, the case of women so circumstanced was then added to the four prohibited cases before-mentioned, of course inviting engagements for the maintenance of infants, or in other words, legalizing the sacrifice of the mother in all cases where a person could be found who would become bound to maintain the infant offspring of the wretched woman. This invitation to new crime, and open toleration of it, is most deeply to be deplored, as, indeed, the Court themselves are subsequently compelled to admit in five years after, namely, by their Report on the Returns of 1815 and 1816, dated 25th June, 1817, where they state that, "From two Texts cited in the

digest of Hindoo law, it seems evident that mothers of infant children were originally prohibited from abandoning their offspring when so much in need of their maternal care, to ascend the funeral pile. VRIHASPATI says, expressly, that the mother of an infant child may '*not* relinquish the care of her infant to ascend the pile.'—And it is the exposition of a SINGLE commentator, (Rughanundhand) *whose authority is confined to* BENGAL; 'that if the infant can be nurtured by any other person, the mother is entitled to burn." [See vol. 1. p. 101.] The Court then suggest the expediency of extending the period from three to seven years, a provision, which, however, never took place; so that from that time to the present, while the best construction of Hindoo law is actually opposed to mothers of infants being burnt at all, the Court, upon their own recorded admission, have, under no better authority than what they admit to be the opinion of one commentator alone, of merely local authority, and this only an opinion *by inference* [See vol. 1. p. 179.] sanctioned the practice of receiving security for the maintenance of these children, and permitted that practice to continue from the year 1814 to this time (13 years) by which an immense additional number of adult lives have undoubtedly fallen victims, and so many more children been made orphans!

With regard to the nature of the SECURITY given for the nurture, Mr. WATSON, the judge, in his letter to the legal Court, dated 16th April, 1818,

says, " We do not understand how the recogni-
" zances entered into for the education and main-
" tenance of the infant orphans of a woman put to
" death in this way are to be forfeited, and the money
" recovered. According to the form,* no sum is
" fixed, and, of course, no debt contracted till the
" party has failed in the performance. The amount
" of the sum, contrary to all usage, is not to be re-
" gulated till the condition of the recognizance has
" been broken, and a discretion is then given to the
" Magistrate to direct what is to be paid. The
" debt thus fixed, immediately becomes absolute,
" but how the sum is to be recovered, the regula-
" tions do not provide." [Vol. 1. p. 99.]

But further; the Legal Court of Nizamut Adawlut itself, as late as the 4th July, 1823, after the Regulations on this subject had been in force above ten years, declares as to these engagements for the professed security for the maintenance of infant children, that " they are not legally indispensable, " so as to justify authoritative interference in the " event of their not being executed!" [Vol. 4. p. 80.] than which no stronger evidence can be furnished of their entire uselessness, even on the admission of the very authority which imposed them.

* This FORM under which the British government thus lent itself to the sacrifice of all the women whose interested relations could procure a nominal security for the maintenance of any child under three years of age was actually drawn up, and settled by the Law Court of Nizamut Adawlut, and was required to be upon stamped paper!

To these Prohibitory Regulations was also added another in the year 1817, (arising out of cases which occurred in 1816) relating to the widow's burning *with* the body of her husband, or *after* it; and this distinction was also made, as usual, upon the authority of the Pundits, whose opinion may be seen in vol. 1. p. 111. The case of burning with the body, or *Sahamarana*, as it is termed, is the ordinary rite of con-cremation; but that of burning subsequently, or post-cremation, called *Anoomarana*, is when the widow is sacrificed, with the sandals, turban, or other relic of the deceased, and which is only permitted to such widows as are absent from their husbands at the time of their death, provided they burn immediately on receiving the intelligence*; or to such as are under another legal disqualification at that period, provided the cause be removed in a day or two; the legal authority for the preferable doctrine of burning at the

* In reference to the rite of *anoomarana*, or post-cremation, the distinctions of the Court of Nizamut Adawlut are worthy of the Jesuits themselves.

Thus, in a case occurring in the district of Hooghly, they say, "The Court presume that this suttee took place two days after the death of the husband: but if it be intended that it occurred two days after information of his death was received by the widow, the suttee was illegal! The magistrate is directed to report on this circumstance."

And again, in a case from Sarum—"It is not expressly mentioned whether this was immediately on the widow's hearing of the death. If the sacrifice was performed immediately on receipt of the intelligence, it was lawful; otherwise, not!"—Vol. 4. p. 140—143.

same pile being, that "a husband having been "burnt on the preceding day, whatever woman fol- "lows him on the succeeding day, neither conveys "herself nor her husband to Paradise!" It is however to be observed, that no wife of a Brahmin can, under any circumstances, be permitted to burn, except upon the pile of her husband, which, as far as I can understand it, appears to be a device, by which the Brahmins would save as many of their own widows as they might be enabled to do, consistently with saving their own credit.

These Regulations as to Infancy, and Post-cremation, were accordingly added by the authority of the British Government, to the Regulations which had preceded them, but, together with them, have been only adopted to be violated in unnumbered instances—the whole of the nine years annual returns being, in fact, little else than a collection of evidence on the violation of these very rules. To these may here be added, the notice of another point reported on by the Pundits (vol. 1. p. 29.) which was, that the widow might lawfully recede from her purpose, after mounting the pile, without losing caste, if the ceremonies were not begun, and even after they *were*, upon undergoing a severe penance; an attempt to legislate upon which opinion of the Pundits was also made by the legal Court, and with equal success, defeat having almost invariably attended all such impotent and unhallowed expedients, as indeed could only have been anticipated by any men better qualified for legislating

on such important subjects than the Lawyers of the Bengal Court of Nizamut Adawlut.

Reverting for a moment to the important point of the supposed authority for the more regular Suttees, it is evident that THE INDIAN GOVERNMENT fully understood the legal opinion of the Pundits as mere PERMISSION, and not INJUNCTION, or REQUISITION.

The Court of Nizamut Adawlut expressly state in their public Report on the Returns of 1815 and 1816, that the practice is *not enjoined*, though authorised, by the Shaster, (vol. 1. p. 107.) and their public regulation of June 1817, for the better enforcement of the prohibitions, as distinctly states the practice to be (I quote their own words,) "not "a religious act, nor has it the sanction of MENU, "and other ancient legislators. On the contrary, "MENU declares that a virtuous wife ascends to "heaven, if, after the decease of her lord, she devotes "herself to pious austerities;" indeed, the whole summary of authorities given by the Legal Court in this document, will convince any one who consults it, that the rite is rather prohibited than enjoined by other commentators as well as MENU. [See it in vol. 1. p. 126.] Conformably to which, we find in a letter of the Governor General, (Marquis Hastings,) dated 19th October, 1817, this passage:— "The practice is far from being inculcated as an "obligation by the most approved authorities of "Hindoo law."—Vol. 1. p. 147.

Having already ventured to express an opinion that even if the Pundits had been more decidedly in favour of the practice, it would by no means have justified the Indian Government in legislating upon their judgment, I will here adduce my reasons for adopting that opinion.

Sir Wm. Jones says of the native lawyers and scholars, "It would be absurd and unjust to pass "an indiscriminate censure on so considerable a "body of men, but my experience justifies me in "declaring, that I could not with an easy conscience "concur in a decision merely on the written opinion "of native lawyers in any cause in which they could "have the remotest interest for misleading the "Court." And again—

"I can no longer bear to be at the mercy of our "Pundits, who deal out the Hindoo law as they "please, and *make* it, at reasonable rates, where "they cannot find it ready made."—*Life by Lord Teignmouth*, pp. 307 and 264.

Again—The deception practised by a Pundit on Mr. Wilford, by introducing in a MS. whole pages of his own composition, which he discoloured, for the purpose of deception, is before the public, on the authority of Lord Teignmouth, in his Preface to Sir Wm. Jones's Life.

Mr. Wilford has now explained the transaction. "When," says he, "the imposition was discovered, "the Pundit flew into the most violent paroxysms of "rage, calling down the vengeance of heaven with

" the most horrid and tremendous imprecations upon " himself and his children, if the extracts were not " true."

Shocking as this must be to the feelings of every one, what follows will increase his astonishment:— " The Pundit brought ten Brahmins, to swear by " what is most sacred in their religion to the ge- " nuineness of the extracts. After severely repri- " manding them for this prostitution of the sacer- " dotal character, I of course refused to allow them " to proceed."—*Vide* Captain F. Wilford's Essay on the sacred Isles of the West.—*Asiatic Researches*, vol. 8. p. 253.

But we have evidence to the point in the present Parliamentary papers. Mr. Bird, the Magistrate of the City Court of Benares, reports two opinions of the Pundit of his Court and the Pundit of the Circuit Court of Benares, in direct opposition to each other; the one declaring a Brahmin woman might legally burn four years after the death of her husband, and the other that she might *not*—both which opinions are given by this Magistrate in vol. 1. p. 134; but the woman was burnt notwithstanding!

Again—The opinion given by the Bombay Pundits on a case of the most atrocious murder of a woman at Poonah, in 1823, was in direct opposition to the opinion of the Bengal Pundits in 1815, on which the Prohibitory Regulations were founded. And yet on this latter opinion, sought after a trial and conviction, two prisoners were pardoned, who

could not possibly have escaped, under the judgment of the Bengal Pundits, as may be seen in vol. 4. p. 189.*

We are not, however, reduced to the dilemma of considering the Pundits as having reported favourably upon this nefarious practice, since the consent to legislate thus erroneously on such a subject was obtained upon testimony from the Pundits, which is by no means conclusive in favour of the practice, and upon the acknowledged confession of the Supreme Government, and the Superior Court, that the utmost which their opinions prove is *permission* for the rite.

I am now therefore to shew, that the Prohibitory Regulations have been decidedly injurious and ruinous, and that, however well intended they may have been, they have grievously increased the evil which they professed to remedy.

But, first, in answer to those who may imagine that it was ever *intended* to rest upon these Regulations, I shall endeavour to shew that they were *never meant to be final in themselves*, but were resorted to, merely as a temporary and remedial mea-

* Mr. Pinkerton, in his Geography, establishes the fact of the little dependance that is to be placed on references of this nature. "The Brahmins, by their monstrous tales and traditions, and innumerable forged MSS. pervert every science and institution to the purposes of their own influence, and diffuse darkness instead of light. It is no wonder that every dissertator should confute his predecessor by his own Pundit and his own MSS. always as ancient as Brahma, if they be not of the present century."

sure, and in order to the ultimate abolition of the practice at a future period.

The Court of Nizamut Adawlut, in their letter to the Governor General (Marquis WELLESLEY,) dated 5th June, 1805, observe—

"The Court apprehend it would be impracticable *at the present time* to abolish the custom in question. It appears, however, to the Court, that hopes may be reasonably entertained that this very desirable object may be gradually effected, and at no distant period of time." [It is not easy to say what a judicial Court would consider "no distant period," especially if it was a Court of Equity; but we have now waited in vain for *twenty-two* years since the expression of this hope.]

They then propose the Prohibitory Regulations, and conclude—

"The Court hope that by the adoption of the measures now proposed by them, abuses will be prevented, and that after information has been obtained of the extent to which the practice is found to prevail, and of the districts in which it has fallen into disuse, or is discountenanced by the principal Hindoo inhabitants, it may be *immediately abolished* in particular districts, and be checked and *ultimately prohibited* in the other parts of these provinces."—Vol. 1. p. 28.

Again—The Court, after repeating this same remark in their Report on the Returns for 1815 and 1816, dated 25th June, 1817, add, "The Court

" propose to keep this ultimate object in view, in " considering the annual reports of Suttees."—Vol. 1. p. 108.

Again—The Governor General (Marquis HASTINGS,) on 19th October, 1817, by letter to the Government Secretary in the Judicial Department, after approving some proposed rules and instructions in furtherance of the object of preventing irregularities, adds, " His Excellency has little " doubt that the rules, *if properly executed*, " will be an effectual bar to any irregular per- " formance of the Suttee," [it will appear hereafter how deplorably this humane hope has been defeated,] " and thus completely answer the end " *more immediately* in view in their formation." Vol. 1. p. 147. So that the mere prevention of illegality being the " more immediate" design of the Regulations, we are necessarily referred to the entire abolition as their ultimate object.

It was indeed impossible that any Government could promise itself that the correction of the abuses of any given system could of itself produce the abolition of that system. It is however to be greatly deplored that the inevitable consequences of permitting certain sacrifices as legal, went virtually to sanction, and set the broad seal of Government upon all that was not prohibited.

But not only were these Regulations never *meant* to be final, they could not, from the nature of things, and from the agents to whose execution

they were confided, effect any really valuable end. For,

First, they were accompanied by no penal sanctions sufficient to ensure their observance.

We have already seen what the Securities for maintenance of Children were worth: no punishment whatever has been awarded for not giving notice to the police, and the punishment of all minor offences, whether of the police or of relations and friends (as they are called) were left in the discretion of the Magistrate, who was of course altogether above the law, himself; while to the cognizance of the Upper Courts alone, belonged the grosser cases of delinquency.

A reference to the whole of the nine years Returns, while it proves that the Law Courts have permitted the foulest cases of guilt to pass either altogether without punishment, or without any adequate punishment, will best shew the utter practical uselessness of the higher remedy, and to those Returns I refer.

Secondly, The execution of the Prohibitory Regulations was entrusted to Native agents, themselves devoted to the same superstition, and connected with its priests and people by every tie of a common creed and country—men whose personal character for venality and corruption, I rather choose to report from the Parliamentary papers, than to record in any language of my own. One resident Magistrate, describing them in the Parliamentary Returns, says—

" The negligence of the Native officers, through " whom the English Magistrates obtain their re- " ports, is proverbial. Repeated instances are offi- " cially returned, in which the sacrifice takes place " before it is known to the police; and others, be- " fore they arrive. The Hindoo officers would " naturally keep out of sight as many cases as they " can, as knowing them to be abhorrent to British " feelings. In many cases the Native officers are " *bribed* to conceal the act, in order to avoid any " reference to the Magistrate. The distance of the " magistrate from a large portion of the district " over which he presides, is another obstacle. The " dead body is generally burnt within a few hours " after death, and a journey to the Magistrate " sometimes takes a day or more."

Extract of a letter from Mr. BLUNT, acting superintendant of police in the Lower Provinces, dated 18th April, 1817 :—

" The authority which the order conveys to the " police darogahs to interfere on such occasions, is " liable to much abuse, as it obviously leaves it in " the power of a police darogah, by delaying to " make the prescribed report to the Magistrate, or " by withdrawing his interference, to permit or al- " low the performance of the ceremony."—Vol. I. p. 46.

Extract of a letter from Mr. SAGE, Judge of the Zillah, 24 Pergunnahs, dated 31st March, 1817 :

" My motive was to prevent the police officers " from making the power vested in them a source

" of oppression and emolument, by *undue exac-*
" *tions*, either for their acquiescence or forbear-
" ance to interfere in all applications that might be
" made to them in cases of Suttee."—Vol. 1. p. 49.

Extract of a letter from Mr. WATSON, Judge, dated Allypore, 16th April, 1816:—

" The reports of the Police darogahs in such
" matters are not much to be trusted."—Vol. 1. p. 99.

The Governor General in Council observes, in his letter of 3d Dec. 1824:—

" The Zemindars and others will naturally with-
" hold information when they only suffer inconve-
" nience from communicating it, and therefore he
" is not surprised at the rarity of the reports of
" impending Suttees received by the police officers.
" THE EVIL BELONGS TO THE SYSTEM."—Vol. 4. p. 154.

To these arguments, drawn from the corruption and indisposition of the agents employed, ought also, in justice to them, to be added the physical impossibility of their exercising such a superintendance as was professed to be expected of them. It appears from WHITE's Considerations on the state of British India, that the Bengal Presidency alone, is divided into above 50 districts, each containing an average population of nearly 100,000 souls, the civil government of which is entrusted to one European, designated a magistrate, and that each district is divided into departments of twenty square miles, the superintendance of the police being en-

trusted in each department to a native officer, the jurisdiction of each of whom extends over at least 50,000 or 60,000 individuals.

No wonder, therefore, that we perpetually read in the Returns, that the Suttee took place before the arrival of the Police officers.

Mr. Bird, the Magistrate of Ghazeepore, addressing the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, (under date of 31st July, 1817,) says—"In no instance "which has come under my notice of the occur- "rence of a Suttee since I have had charge of this "district, have the Police ever been informed of it "in time to make the inquiries enjoined by the Or- "ders*." Vol. 1. p. 136.

If it should be urged against this representation, that no other than Native Officers *could* be employed in such a service; the argument is valid as far as it goes, but the obvious answer to it is, that, with no better agency than Hindoos and Mahometans, thus notoriously corrupt and profligate, the attempt to regulate an acknowledged system of crime at the risk of aggravating its evils, and prolonging its existence, never ought to have been made by any good or wise Government.

* Should any one desire further information on the venality and corruption of the Native police of India, he has only to refer to a valuable Treatise on the subject, which is contained in the well-known periodical Work, entitled, "The Friend of India," written by the most intelligent Europeans who have long resided in India, and have enjoyed the best opportunities of observation; the principal Treatises in which Work have been since reprinted in this country by Messrs. Kingsbury and Co. Leadenhall-street.

The whole nine year's Returns fully demonstrate a result, which might, indeed, have been easily anticipated, namely, the utter hopelessness of what, in the language of LORD AMHERST, the present Governor-General himself in 1824, may be termed "the evil of the system," a system under which such incongruous and inadequate materials were brought into action as could never reasonably offer the remotest hope of advantage to those who employed them, who could not but know, from accumulated experience, the impossibility of placing such agents above corruption, especially when arraying them against their own superstitions. It is true, that in promulgating these Prohibitory Rules, it was professed, by authority, to be hoped "they would have a beneficial influence in check-"ing the frequency of the instances of voluntary "Suttee, by lessening the sense of obligation under "which there was reason to believe many women "were induced to make this sacrifice of their lives, "and by shewing that the practice was far from "being inculcated as such," (that is, as an obligation) "by the most approved authorities of the "Hindoo law," [Vol. 4. p. 19.] but on this it may be observed,

First—The Government Regulations have never brought before any victim the fact that the sacred law of the Hindoos does not command, but only permits, the Rite, nor is any one obliged to inform her of this fact; much less, that the best interpreters

of her own Law, are decidedly opposed even to the permission of the rite.

Secondly—The Government Regulations are merely levelled at the prohibited cases, leaving it to be inferred by the widow and her family, that if she does not fall within them, the British Government allows the sacrifice, so that she is not only without the information which she is supposed to possess, in order to her forming a correct opinion, but is influenced by other considerations calculated only to mislead her. How then is she in a situation to exercise a sound discretion, even laying out of the question the influence of mercenary Brahmins, and the solicitations of interested relations, all in league to deceive her, both as to the nature of the obligation itself, and the real intentions of the British Government. The illiteracy of Hindoo women has been well described in the Parliamentary papers by a most intelligent resident, Mr EWER, the acting superintendant of police in the Lower Provinces, who in his Appeal to the Governor General in Council, dated Calcutta, 18th Nov. 1818, says—

"It is well known that the Education of Hindoo "females of all ranks precludes the possibility of "their having of themselves any acquaintance "whatever with the contents of the Shasters; and "consequently, on all subjects connected with "them, they must be compelled to trust implicitly "to the guidance of others. These are all, in one

" way or other, directly interested, and must be " gainers by, the Widow's death. It is not very " probable that they will state Suttees to be nothing " but a praiseworthy act left to the discretion of the " Widow, they will of course represent it as an " absolute duty, the neglect of which must be " punished by disgrace both in this world and the " next."—See Vol. 1, page 228.

In confirmation of which, may be cited the judgment of Mr. MOLONY, the Magistrate of the district of Burdwan, in Bengal, who says in his Report dated 14th December, 1818, " whatever little Education " is given to the Hindoo men, is never extended to " the female sex, I have never met an instance of " a Hindoo woman of whatever rank, who could write " even her name;" and in proof that what has been supposed to be voluntary on the part of the woman, has no pretence to the name, it may be observed, that the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, in their Letter to the Supreme Government, dated 5th June, 1805, [V. 1, p. 27.] say, " most unwarrantable means are " sometimes used to give the appearance of a " voluntary act to that which the woman neither " intended nor consented to"; and again on this particular point of the ordinary absence of all free choice on the part of the unhappy victim, Mr. EWER, in the same Appeal which has just been quoted, (dated 18th November, 1818) says " I know it is " generally supposed that a Suttee takes place with " the free will and consent of the Widow, indeed " that she frequently persists in her intention to

" burn, in spite of the arguments and intreaties of " her relations, but there are many reasons for " thinking that such an event as a voluntary Suttee " very rarely occurs: few Widows would ever think " of sacrificing themselves, unless overpowered by " force or persuasion; very little of either is suffi- " cient to overcome the physical or mental powers " of the majority of Hindoo females; and a Widow " who would turn with natural and instinctive hor- " ror from the first hint of sharing her Husband's " pile, will be at length gradually brought to pro- " nounce a reluctant consent, because distracted " with grief at the event, without one friend to " advise or protect her, she is little prepared to " oppose the surrounding crowd of hungry Brahmins, " and interested relations, either by argument or " force. Accustomed to look on the Priests with " the highest veneration, and to attach implicit " belief to all their assertions, she dares not, if " she was able to make herself heard, deny the cer- " tainty of the various advantages which must attend " the Sacrifice: that by becoming a Suttee, she will " remain so many years in Heaven, rescue her hus- " band from Hell, and purify the family of her " parents and husband; while on the other hand, " that disgrace in this life, and continued transmi- " gration into the body of a female animal, will be " the certain consequence of refusal. In this state " of confusion a few hours quickly pass, and the " Widow is burnt before she has had time even to " think on the subject. Should utter indifference

" for her husband, and superior sense enable her to " preserve her judgment, and to resist the argu- " ments of those about her, it will avail her little, " the people will not on any account be disappointed " of their show; and the entire population of a " village will turn out to assist in dragging her to " the bank of the river, and in keeping her down " on the pile. Under these circumstances nine out " of ten widows are burnt to death. The sacrifices " are more frequently offered to secure the temporal " good of the survivors than to ensure the spiri- " tual welfare of the sufferer or her husband. The " widow is scarcely ever a free agent, and therefore " her opinion on the subject can be of no weight; " whether she appear glad or sorry, stupid, com- " posed, or distracted, is no manner of proof of " her real feelings."

To prove, however, upon the best authority, that the Prohibitory Regulations have been practically only productive of evil, and that nothing short of Abolition will suffice, I will now refer to the Opinions of Magistrates, Judges, Collectors, Civil and Military Officers, Chaplains of the East India Company, and even to the highest Authorities of the Indian Empire, previously to which, it may however be necessary to apprize the Court that as some few testimonies under this head, as well as under some following heads, will be found to be Extracts from Letters which do not appear in the Parliamentary Papers, they will I hope give me credit when I assure them, upon the responsibility

of my own character, that they have all been written by men of the first respectability, and the most unimpeachable veracity, the greater part of whom have been long employed in the service of the Company, have been resident for very many years in India, and are, in every respect, competent to the task of forming an accurate judgment on the character and extent of the evil they deplore, as well as on the practicability of its suppression. I pledge myself to the Court, that no document will be thus quoted by me which is not at this moment in Court, under the hand of the individual from whom it purports to have been received. I have further to observe, that the different writers of these letters, are, at this time, in England, and are, therefore, within reach, in the event of the accuracy of their information being questioned, to support it in person; at the same time, that I have not, for obvious reasons, deemed it expedient to apply for their permission to produce their names, although I am satisfied the request would have been willingly conceded; because, under the assurance which I could give of their responsibility, it did not appear to be necessary, and because the greater part of these gentlemen are intending to return to India.

I proceed first to the Parliamentary evidence, in proof that the Prohibitory Regulations have been only productive of evil, and that nothing short of Abolition will suffice.

Mr. Ewer, Acting Superintendant of Police in

the Lower Provinces, in his appeal to the Governor General in Council, dated Calcutta, 18th of November, 1818, says —

" In permitting or authorizing Suttees, we are " by no means showing a proper forbearance to- " wards the religious customs, or long established " prejudices of the Hindoos, but we are virtually " sanctioning the sacrifice of widows by their " relations, an act no where enjoined by any of the " Shasters." [He had before observed, that MENU, together with other authorities of great respectability, prescribes the duties of a widow, without hinting that burning herself is one of the most important; and her relations are no where told that they are to induce her to become a Suttee, either by force, or persuasion.] " On the " contrary, a crime which their own laws would " punish with death, and only tolerated by our " Government because we overlook the impudent " imposition which has transformed a recommen- " dation to the widow to accompany her husband, " into an Order which the Relations must carry " into effect, if she should evince symptoms of " disobedience.

" I admit, that, supposing the practice to be " expressly prohibited, perhaps one voluntary and " legal Suttee out of a hundred murders, will be " prevented, and the widow in consequence feel " miserable for the rest of her life. But I call a " voluntary and legal Suttee one in which the " widow is fully aware that she is going to per-

" form not a prescribed but a recommended duty ;
" and I imagine that a case of this nature scarcely
" ever occurs."—Vol. 1. p. 228.

Again.—After affirming the perfect practicability of complete prohibition without danger, he adds, " It appears to me, that if the practice is " allowed to exist at all, the less notice we take of " it, the better; because the apparent object of the " interference of the police, is to compel the people " to observe the rules of their own Shasters, (which " of themselves they will not obey,) by ascertaining " the particular circumstances of the condition of " the widow. The first of these is her age, which " will always admit of dispute, the natives seldom " being within five or six years of the truth; the " second, her pregnancy, equally difficult to ascer- " tain, and as well as the third, calculated to excite " extreme disgust; the fourth and fifth, are easily " evaded, because relations—neighbours—all are " interested in the performance of the Suttee, and " in deceiving the Darogah. But all these inqui- " ries open a door for the extortion of the Police " officers; and it is the opinion of the Magistrate " of a district in which Suttee is particularly fre- " quent, (and I entirely concur with him,) that few " are now reported in which the Darogah has not " been paid either for speedy attendance to prevent " the additional horror of the state of the corpse, " or for permitting an illegal sacrifice. If, (as I " cannot for a moment suppose,) the object of the " interference was gradually to deter the people

" from the practice, by subjecting the widow and " her family to disgrace, or extortion, it does not " appear to answer the proposed end; for with the " same means of obtaining information, the number " burnt in 1817, far exceeds that in the preced- " ing years.

" In 1805, (when the Court proposed the Regu- " lations,) they state, that hopes may be reasonably " entertained, that the abolition, (although then " impracticable,) might be gradually effected, and " at no distant period of time. These hopes have " not been realized; nor do we appear nearer to " the abolition of Suttee, than we were at the above " period, thirteen years back. It is true that the " interference of the police may, in some cases, " have induced compliance with the rules of the " Shaster, but the official attendance of the Darogah " stamps every regular Suttee with the sanction of " Government; and I must submit, that authoriz- " ing a practice, is not the way to effect its gra- " dual abolition."—Vol. 1. p. 229.

Mr. Oakeley, the Magistrate of the Zillah Hooghly, by letter, addressed to the Superintendant of Police, Calcutta, dated 19th of December, 1818, says—

" Previous to 1813, no interference of the " Police was authorized, and widows were sacrificed " legally, or illegally, as it might happen; but the " Hindoos were then aware that the Government " regarded the custom with natural horror, and " would do any thing short of direct prohibition to

" discourage, and gradually abolish it. The case " is now altered. The police officers are ordered " to interfere for the purpose of ascertaining " that the ceremony is performed in conformity " with the rules of the Shasters, and in that event, " to allow its completion. This is granting the " authority of Government for burning widows; " and it can scarcely be a matter of astonishment " that the number of sacrifices should be doubled, " when the sanction of the ruling power is added " to the recommendation of the Shaster.

" But while I am entirely convinced that the " interference of the Darogahs has been the prin- " cipal cause of the late increase in the number of " Suttees, I can by no means agree that this super- " intendance generally effects its intended object— " that of preventing the Suttee, if not performed " agreeably to the rules of the Shaster—for the " Magistrate will on this, as well as on most other " occasions, receive a report true or false, as the in- " terest of the Darogah may dictate. The necessity " for his attendance, must, unless he is hastened by " a present, frequently occasion considerable delay, " and the corpse become putrid before the widow " can be burnt with it. Altogether, the instruc- " tions to the Darogah, besides augmenting the " number of sacrifices, and disgusting the Hindoos " by a string of inquiries into the state of the wi- " dow, appear to me to have had no effect, except- " ing that of affording them another means of " extortion."—Vol. 1. p. 236.

Mr. WARNER, the Magistrate of the Twenty-four Pergunnahs, by letter to the acting Superintendant of Police in the lower Provinces, dated in December, 1818, writes—

"The Police officer receives information "from some part of the family that the widow "wishes to burn herself on the funeral pile of her "husband;—he in consequence attends—a state-"ment is drawn up, setting forth that the woman "voluntarily devotes herself; that there is no "obvious objection, and that all is conducted in "conformity to the orders of Government, and the "Shasters. The consent is obtained, evidently "previous to information being given, and all the "necessary preparations made. Supposing the "woman wished to withdraw the consent already "given, what time has she for it? All is bustle "and confusion—the poor creature suffering under "the distress and agitation of mind caused by the "recent death of her husband; the corpse before "her; and the surrounding friends and relations "calling upon her to devote herself; praising her "resolution, and pointing out the bliss declared "to be awaiting her on the consummation of this "act. Considering these circumstances, can it "be wondered that so many instances occur? "Who are these women, and what opportunity "has the Magistrate of ascertaining the real facts "of the case? The Suttee invariably takes place "before the official inquiry is sent; after its con-"clusion, who will come forward to point out any

" illegal act during the performance of the cere-
" mony."—Vol. 1, p. 239.

Mr. CHAPMAN, the Magistrate of the Zillah Jessore, writes to the acting Superintendant of Police in the Lower Provinces, under date of the 23d of December, 1818. " I chiefly attribute the " cause of the increase, to the interference of the " Government. The Police has in no instance " within my recollection, been able to prevent the " prosecution of a Suttee; as care, no doubt, has " always been previously taken by those interested " in the advancement of it, that no irregularity " should appear, authorizing any interference by " the Police. The interference of the Police has, " by legalizing the practice, increased the number " by withdrawing from all, the danger of any pe-" nalty. Prior to the promulgation of the circular " orders, the practice was known by all the Natives " to be particularly obnoxious to the Government, " and universally condemned by every European " serving under it, however high or low his situa-" tion in life might be."—Vol. 1, p. 241.

Mr. PELLY, Magistrate of the Southern Concan, Bombay, writes, on the 22nd of September, 1819. " Some few widows, perhaps, escape, as falling " under the exceptions specified in the Bengal " Pundits Reports, while on the other hand, it can " hardly be doubted, that the necessary presence " of the police officers of Government at those " immolations, stamp on them that character of " strict legality, and seem to afford them that

" degree of countenance on the part of Govern-
" ment, which must produce an evil effect."—
Vol. I, p. 255.

Mr. MARRIOTT, the Magistrate in the Northern Concan, [Bombay,] writes, under date, Tannah, 25th of September, 1819. " After having weighed, " with every deliberation, the mode of carrying " into effect the intention of Government," (viz. the Prohibitory Regulations,) " I became most fully " satisfied, that if the prohibitions to the sacrifice " were to be determined by Native Police officers, " the practice of that awful rite would shortly mul-
" tiply manifold—an opinion partly founded on the " venality of the Natives in general, in this case " rendered more likely by the augmentation of " their consequence, occasioned by their decision " being declared unalterable in the disposal of life, " and partly because it was the prevalent opinion " amongst the Natives, that this Sacrifice would " not be tolerated by the British Government."

He then expressly declines to promulgate the Prohibitory Regulations in his part of Bombay, alleging as follows :—

" To have given the Instructions, would at " once have informed the community that the sacri-
" fice is allowed by the British Government, and " therefore might be performed with impunity. It " would also have opened a source of emolument " to such Native officers, as are corrupt enough to " sell their authority at the expense of a sacrifice of " a human victim. With the confidence which

" would thus have been given to its performance, and " with the inducement which I have mentioned to the " Police officers, I am certain the number of victims " would have greatly increased; and my opinion " has been verified by occurrences in Bengal."

He then adds, that he has himself saved many from destruction, whom he calls, " poor infatuated, " or intoxicated females;" and states, that he had positively refused two applications for Suttees, and punished the parties attending a sacrifice who had given no previous notice of its performance.

Sir EVAN NEPEAN the Governor; and Mr. BELL, and Mr. WARDEN, two of the Members of Council, concur with these views; but Mr. PRENDERGAST, (who had before opposed the desire of the Governor to return the thanks of the Government to Mr. HOCKLEY, the Magistrate, for a successful interference of that gentleman to save a life,) dissents; so that here are Three Members of Council against the Prohibitory Regulations, while One only is in favour of their adoption.—Vol. 1, p. 256.

Mr. HALE, the Judge of the Southern Concan Court, writes—under date of the 4th of October, 1819, in arguing against the Prohibitory Regulations being adopted there. " As soon as it becomes " universally known that free toleration of this " awful ceremony is acknowledged strictly accord- " ing to the tenets of the Shaster, the custom will " again revive; for, although a considerable num- " ber of Suttees must necessarily be annually

" prevented under the present restriction, yet it " remains a question whether the clear exposition " of the Hindoo law, as given by the Pundits of the " Sudder Dewannee Adawlut, at Fort William, " may not excite an emulation among those who, " by its provisions are permitted to burn, from a " large proportion of the population, probably, " never having read, and still fewer understood " them."—Vol. 1, p. 259.

This prophecy was, alas! but too correct. The practice did revive in consequence of the adoption of the Prohibitory Regulations; and the sixth Parliamentary publication on the subject, expressly returns sixty-six Suttees in the succeeding year, 1820—fifty in 1821—forty-seven in 1822—and thirty-eight in 1823—as having all taken place in the Southern Concan. While no one denies Mr. PRENDERGAST the merit of correct intentions, who will envy him his feelings?* This result is the more to be deplored, as Mr. FORBES, in his Oriental Memoirs, published in 1813, says, " No woman has burnt herself on the Island of " Bombay, for the last fifty years, to my know- " ledge; nor do I believe this species of suicide " has been allowed, since the English possessed it."

Thus, also, another authority of a somewhat later period, says, " No deluded female is permitted

* Perhaps the least justifiable Minute of Council appearing in the Parliamentary papers, is that of this Gentleman, especially in the personality of its conclusion.—See it in Vol. 1, p. 260.

" to sacrifice herself in Bombay;—the English " Government at that place will not suffer it."—Dr. BUCHANAN.

It is remarkable, that the Government of Fort St. George, was equally alarmed at the proposed introduction of the Bengal Regulations; for the London Court of Directors having, on the 4th of March, 1818, recommended that the Bengal Rules should be also adopted on the Madras side of India, the answer was, as might naturally have been expected, that only infinite mischief could be anticipated from such weak and mistaken policy.

The Governor in Council of Fort St. George, by an answer to the Directors, dated the 4th of January, 1822, says, that " the proposed rules " would have afforded a more express sanction for " the practice, than it had heretofore obtained from " Government, and might have had the effect of ex- " tending it by the notice attracted to the subject. " That a practice so abhorrent to reason and huma- " nity should entirely cease, was much to be de- " sired; but the contrary effect might follow any inju- " dicious endeavours to suppress it."—Vol. 2, p. 69.

Mr. PATTLE, the Chief Judge of the Calcutta Court of Circuit at Allypore, in transmitting the Suttee Reports of his division for 1817, writes to the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, under date of the 4th April, 1818:—

" The increase of Human Sacrifices appears to " confirm an apprehension before expressed by this " Court to the Superior Court, that any interfe-

" rence, save that of a total prohibition, under the " severest penalties, will only be productive of a " mistaken jealousy and opposition, which hopes, " by increasing the prevalence of this superstitious " practice, to induce us to discontinue all interfe- " rence." And again—

" As long as the Hindoo population persists in " the present bigotry, and are generally so unci- " vilized and ignorant, we cannot hope that they " will be otherwise than exceedingly dissatisfied at " every interference on our part, which has any " cognizance of their religious ceremonies; and " however plain may be the proof we adduce to " them that the interference we proposed is only " in cases not countenanced by the tenets of their " religion, and therefore justly liable to prohibition, " we shall not by this, nor by any other means, " gain their voluntary acquiescence in the propriety " of such proceedings, nor shall we get them for " an instant to be satisfied with a less degree of " toleration than that which shall commit uncondi- " tionally to the discretion of their Priests and of " themselves, the entire direction and regulation of " all matters connected with their religion and its " customs."—Vol. 1, p. 176.

I am bound to inform the Court, that the Second Judge (Mr. Rees) and the Third Judge (Mr. Tod) take care to state that they only sign this document as a matter of form, but that they do not concur in this opinion of the senior Judge. There is something peculiar in such a circumstance, but I quote

it as no other than a single opinion, and therefore, "*valeat quantum valere possit.*" I do not ask that it should go for more than it is worth, but since the recorded instances are few indeed, of opposition to the religious, moral, and intellectual light now dawning upon India, it is perhaps quite as well that the Proprietors of East India stock should be apprized of the views of their different functionaries while exercising office in India. In the next year, under date Allypore, 6th March, 1819, the same Chief Judge, Mr. PATTLE, writes, with the Returns of 1818, that the comparative statement of increase in the four years of 1815, 16, 17, and 18, "justifies his being confirmed in the belief "before, more than once, expressed to the Supe-"rior Court, that any interference save that of a "total prohibition, under the severest penalties," &c. &c. as he had before expressed himself.

In this, however, as in the former case, the Chief Judge stands alone—reminding us of an honourable minority of no greater amount, in which Mr. Fox was once found, and of which he said—that he was *not ashamed of his company.* The two other Judges (now Mr. SEALY and Mr. TOD) are found to signify their signatures as having been formal only; and those two Judges declare themselves more plainly (by a subsequent letter of 17th March, 1819,) for the continuance of Human Sacrifices, in the following remarkable terms:—

"We are of opinion that Suttees could not be "prohibited without interfering with the Religious

"prejudices of the Hindoo community, *an object* "*which could never have been in the contempla-* "*tion of the ruling power.*" [Vol. 1, p. 219.] From which it should seem that these two learned Judges could never have seen the original declaration of the Supreme Authority on the 5th February, 1805, namely, that Religious prejudices were only to be consulted "in cases in which it was prac- "ticable, *consistently with the principles of Mo-* "*rality, Reason, and Humanity.*"*

Mr. Smith, the Judge of the Benares Court of

* It is hoped that this production of *adverse* testimony, as well as other instances of a similar nature, will furnish the best answer to the Hon. Chairman's assertion, that only such opinions had been cited by me as were favourable to my own cause, and that if he had pleased, he could have occupied the attention of the Court by the production of *an equal number* of authorities of an opposite character. However unwilling I may be to enter into any personal collision with so estimable an Individual, the interests of truth imperiously require that I should assure the Proprietors and the Public, that this representation is incapable of being supported. There can be no doubt that the Hon. Chairman himself gave full credit to the accuracy of the statement which he made; but it could only have been offered to the Court, upon the incorrect information of some person who had (no doubt unintentionally) misled him. I invite the most minute and scrupulous examination of the several volumes of the Parliamentary Papers, in order to satisfy the most incredulous, of the honesty and fidelity which have been exercised by me in the references which I have made; and they will then be fully convinced that, so far from the testimonies for continuing these horrid immolations in any degree equalling in amount, the evidences for their abolition, there does not exist the most remote proportion between the two authorities.

Circuit, writes, (2d August, 1821)—" Our Govern-
" ment, by modifying the thing, and issuing Orders
" about it—Orders which even the Government and
" the Judges themselves do not appear clearly to
" comprehend—have thrown the ideas of the Hin-
" doos upon the subject into a complete state of
" confusion. They know not what is allowed, and
" what interdicted, but upon the whole they have
" a persuasion that our Government, whom they
" most erroneously suppose to be indifferent about
" the lives of Natives, are rather favourable to Sut-
" tees than otherwise. They will *then* believe that
" we abhor the usage when we prohibit it *in toto,*
" by an absolute and peremptory law. They have
" no idea that we might not do so with the most
" perfect safety. They conceive our power and
" our will to be commensurate."

And again—" The essence of the Rules is, that if
" the Suttee be according to the Shaster, it is law-
" ful."—Vol. 2, p. 67.

Mr. C. M. Lushington, Magistrate of Trichinopoly, addressing the Southern Provincial Court there, under date of 1st Oct. 1819, says—" Infor-
" mation is always sent, after the fiend-like cere-
" mony has been completed. I have consequently
" never had it in my power either to grant or re-
" fuse the assistance of the Police."—Vol. 2, p. 103.

In proof that the Court of Nizamut Adawlut itself, after four years' experience of the Prohibitory Regulations, considered the experiment as conclusively against them, the following testimony from

their own admission is very remarkable. It occurs in their remarks on the Returns of 1815, 16, 17, and 18. Vol. 1, p. 222.

"The fact of the increase, which appears to have "been hitherto progressive, must in the opinion of "the Court unavoidably excite a doubt whether the "measures publicly adopted with the humane view "of diminishing the number of these Sacrifices, by "pointing out the cases in which the Hindoo law "is considered to permit them, and those in which "it forbids them, have not rather been attended "with *a contrary* effect than the one contem-"plated." After which, they fairly admit that they "fear the practice has been rather inflamed "than repressed by the interference of the Public "Authorities."

And the Governor General in Council, on adverting to this opinion, observes, on the 30th July, 1819, that "*He* is reluctantly led to express his "apprehension that *the greater confidence with* "*which the people perform this rite under the* "*sanction of Government,* as implied or avowed "in the Circular Orders already in force (combined "with the excitement of religious bigotry by the "continual agitation of the question,) may have "tended *to augment rather than diminish the fre-*"*quency* of these Sacrifices."—Vol. 1, p. 242.

Again:—"The Governor General in Council, in December 1822, when observing upon a small decrease in the years 1819 and 1820, as compared with those of 1817 and 1818, does not attempt to account for such decrease by suggesting it to be

the result of the Prohibitory Regulations, which he would hardly have failed to have done, if he had referred it to such a source.—Vol. 3. p. 1.

And further:—The Governor General in Council, remarking in the year 1822 on the increase of fifty-seven in the returns of 1821 beyond those of 1820, and then comparing the whole five years preceding, observes, "The comparative result "above recorded does *not*, in the opinion of the "Governor General in Council, *afford any satis-* "*factory ground for assuming the practice to be* "*generally on the decline.*" And this, after Seven years experience of the Prohibitory Regulations.—Vol. 3. p. 42.

Mr. HARINGTON, so long the Judge of the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, at length declares himself, after the experience of Nine years under the operation of the Prohibitory Regulations, in favour of the abolition by law, by Minute addressed to the Governor General in Council, and dated 28th June, 1813:—

"I wish," says he, "to press upon the serious "attention of the Governor General in Council, "the ascertained continuance of the irregularities "and abuses unsanctioned by the Hindoo laws in "the actual performance of the Suttee immolation, "as frequently practised.

"The Official Reports of the Magistrates, "which are annually submitted to Government "by the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, contain "abundant evidence of the illegal practice here "referred to; and it is further a notorious fact

" that, especially in Bengal, in opposition to the " express ordinances of the Shaster, which forbid " any restraint whatever upon the widow to pre- " vent her escape from the funeral pile, and pro- " vide for her being lifted off, in the event of her " being terrified, she is often bound down with " cords to the pile with the body of her deceased " husband, or fastened with bamboos placed over " her; so that she cannot possibly escape, not- " withstanding a change of resolution, and in " numerous cases the Suttee takes place without " any previous notice to the local police officer; this " unfortunately not having been required by any " of the circular orders yet issued."

Again:—" I am desirous of putting upon " record some considerations which I acknowledge " have produced in my own mind a strong belief, " if not a full conviction, that whenever it may be " judged expedient to suppress this barbarous " practice by legal prohibition, instead of restrict- " ing it to what is sanctioned by the Shaster, as at " present, it will not be found impracticable, or, " as far as I can judge, be attended with any se- " rious political danger." He then expressly handles the question, " Whether it would be " perfectly safe and consistent, with the regard " due to our national security in India, to prohibit " and put down, by legal penalties, a practice of " immemorial antiquity, and declares that it is not " commanded as a Religious duty, or generally re- " garded as such; for while some hold it to be " praiseworthy, and entitled to reward, others, on

" the highest authorities of Hindoo law and reli-
" gion, condemn it as illegal and sinful in its nature."

He then recommends that Brahmins and others aiding, be held guilty of homicide. Nay (he says), the existing law would be sufficient for the purpose, only that it has never been applied to the case of Suttees, though it might; and this law, he thinks, only need to be enforced, on previous notice that it would be. A few offences, he says, might perhaps occur, but after a few examples he has " no doubt " that the practice would be soon abandoned, as un-
" sanctioned by Government, and subjecting the
" aiders and abettors to punishment by the Crimi-
" nal Courts." [The present system having clearly their sanction.] " It is impossible that a legisla-
" tive enactment to prevent assistance being here-
" after given in the Suttee immolation, with a
" view to preserve the lives of a number of miser-
" able women from suicide, in a state of affliction
" from the recent death of their husbands, and to
" put a stop to the horrible abuses and cruelties,
" which, unsanctioned by the Hindoo laws, have
" too frequently attended an involuntary perpetra-
" tion of this sacrifice, could be imputed to any
" other motives than what would really govern
" such an enactment; and which, therefore, might
" be fairly and fully declared without danger of its
" being misconstrued into any thing like a general
" design to put down, by authority, the religious
" system with which the inhuman practice referred
" to, is imperfectly connected."

And again:—" The experience of more than

" half a century has proved to the conviction of " every Hindoo and Mussulman, our complete tole- " ration of their respective Religions, with a cau- " tious abstinence from all interruption of their " established customs and observances, as far as " sanctioned by their own laws, and *consistent* " *with the fundamental principles of Society.*"

Mr. Harington then observes, that the principle of toleration of their Religion has been necessarily relaxed already, in the administration of criminal justice—quotes the execution of the Rajah Nundkomar and other Brahmins, which he calls " so deep an encroachment upon their tenets and " prejudices;" the killing of a Brahmin being counted one of the five great sins—the abolition of infanticide at Saugur, enforced by a military guard—the suppression of the Brahminical practice of " sitting Dhurna,"—and the destruction of children by the Rajkoomars; he adds, that such instances afford ground of presumption that other superstitious and inhuman practices, particularly the Suttee sacrifice, though sanctioned *in a certain degree* by the Shaster, and by popular opinion, might be suppressed by a legislative enactment *with equal safety and success;* and he concludes with this able summary of his argument:

" On a deliberate view of all those instances in " which the laws, customs, and prejudices of the " Hindoos, when found to be at variance with " the principles of justice and good of society, " have been necessarily superseded and abrogated

" by the laws and regulations of the British go-
" vernment; and in the whole of which, such su-
" percession has been quietly submitted to, as
" obviously and exclusively originating in motives
" of equity and humanity, unconnected with any
" degree of Religious intolerance; we may, I think,
" safely conclude, that a similar result will attend
" the enactment of a legislative provision to pre-
" vent the yearly sacrifice of several hundreds of
" deluded unoffending females, born and living
" under the protection of the British Government,
" whenever it shall be deemed expedient to
" make and promulgate the requisite enactment for
" that purpose." And Mr. Harington afterwards adds, " I cannot hesitate to adopt the opinion ex-
" pressed by the Second Judge of the Court, Mr.
" Courtenay Smith, that the toleration of the
" practice is a reproach to our Government; and
" even now, I am disposed to agree with him, that
" the entire and immediate abolition of it would be
" attended with no sort of danger."—Vol. 4. p. 11, 12, 13, 18.

And again: In Mr. Harington's Remarks, submitted, when he was in England, to the President of the Board of Controul at his desire, on the 30th May, 1822, he says: " Whatever opinion may
" be entertained on the policy which has hitherto
" induced the British Government to tolerate the
" immolation of Hindoo widows, as considered to
" be in some degree a religious observance, (al-
" though it is not a prescribed duty, as may be

" seen in Mr. Colebrooke's Translation of Original " Texts on the subject, printed in Vol. IV. of the " Transactions of the Asiatic Society,) there can " be no sufficient or legitimate reason for permit- " ting a practice so repugnant to every feeling and " principle of humanity, in opposition to the only " laws which can be pleaded in justification of it." —Vol. 4. p. 20.*

All this testimony is the more important from Mr. Harington, as he was the first to recommend the Prohibitory Regulations, having been a member of the Supreme Court of Judicature, both in 1805, when the expediency of interference was first agitated; and in 1812, when the Regulations were finally adopted.

It is here worthy of observation, that a Brahmin, as late as the year 1823, deposes judicially, that *it is the custom* of the Brahmins, if a Suttee escapes alive out of the fire, to throw her in again. —See Vol. .4 p. 176.

So much for the Prohibitory Regulations in 1815, professing to make such an act highly penal, while, in point of fact, the Criminal Judicature has rarely or never punished for it; and the Brahmins, on their own shewing, have treated the prohibition with invariable contempt.

* The following Extract from a letter to Sir Evan Nepean, dated " Camp at Talneir, 28th Feb. 1818," will shew that we are less squeamish in our Military operations:—" The circumstances " under which this Fortress resisted, rendered it absolutely ne- " cessary that a severe example should be made. The Killadar " was *hanged*, and the garrison *put to the sword*." Signed " T. " Hislop."—Papers on Pindarry and Mahratta Wars, p. 237.

In further proof that the Restrictions operate as a permission, the following testimony may be quoted.

"It can scarcely be expected that the Brahmins "are such bad casuists as to overlook so prominent "a part of the law as that which gives sanction to "established custom, even in contradiction to what "may be written."—Extract from Minute of Mr. BARNARD, President of Regulation Committee, Bombay, addressed to the Government there on 21st June, 1824, [Vol. 4. p. 209.]

The same point will be established by the following Extract from an account of a Suttee at Severndroog, enclosed in a letter from the Secretary of the Bombay Government to the Magistrate of the Southern Concan, dated 20th October, 1824.

"The friends had returned with an Order or "rather Permission, for the Sacrifice. This per- "mission I found that the people most ignorantly "and perversely abused; and at every stage of my "argument with them, an appeal was made to the "Order of Government as a vindication of their "conduct. There can be no doubt of the benevo- "lent intention of Government in issuing such an "Order, and as little of its beneficial influence in "many instances, as it prevents the employment of "force; but the people construe it into a direct "approval of the dreadful act, and it seemed to "form a triumphant answer to all my arguments."

Again:—"Upon my asking how they could "believe that their Shaster came from God, when it "desired them to do what their own consciences told

"them was sinful, the only answer they attempted "to give was, It is the custom, and we have got the "Government Order for so doing." [Vol. 4, p. 212]

To the same effect precisely, Mr. WARD, who was long resident in India, in a printed letter addressed, a few years since, to the present EARL OF CLARENDON, (then the Right Hon. C. J. VILLIERS) relates this remarkable fact. "In 1817, I was "riding near Serampore, where there had been a "Suttee—after making enquiries respecting the "family and rank of the widow, I addressed a few "individuals on the crime in which they had been "assisting. One of these men answered 'Sir, "whatever the act now committed may be, we have "nothing to fear—You' (meaning the English "Government) 'must see to that, for the Police "Magistrate has been here, and given the order, "and according to that order, the woman has been "burnt.'"

To this may be added the testimony of an European long resident in India, but now in this country, who is known to myself, and who writes:—

"The Government ascertaining the willingness "of the widow to suffer, take down her name, and "the concurring testimony of her friends, and then "furnish an official order to permit the deed. This "has no other effect than simply to *legalize*, and "to make the Government a sort of party to, a "deed, which before such interference, took place "at the option of the Natives themselves."

To the same point, a civil Officer of the Com-

pany at present in this country, writes as follows in the last month :—

" The duty of not taking half measures in putting " down this practice should be noticed. The regu- " lations declare that, under certain specified cir- " cumstances, the Suttee is not to be allowed by " the Magistrates: this is in effect saying that if " these circumstances do not exist, it may proceed. " The inference was undeniable; and the Brahmins " soon quoted the Government Regulations against " any European Officer who interfered beyond the " letter of the rule."

A Chaplain of the Hon. Company who has been long resident in India, and is now in this country, writes on 23rd February, 1827 :—

" The measure of the Bengal Government by " only requiring that it should in no case be prac- " tised except according to the strict directions and " formalities of the Shasters, actually legalized it " by British authority, and that too, to the great joy " and benefit of the Brahmins (who are in all cases " among the principal instigators) in securing to " them, and even increasing, their fees by multiply- " ing the formalities. Every evil might have been " anticipated from this unwise act of the Bengal " Government."

I will now read an extract from a letter from the Resident at Delhi in 1822, addressed to a member of the then and present Parliament, respecting the impolicy of the Prohibitory Regulations.

" To see what the Government has done with a

" view to discourage Suttees we need not go far—
" nothing has been attempted beyond an endeavour
" to ascertain the number of Suttees, legal and
" illegal, performed in each year; and a slight hint
" at disapprobation of the illegal. The Sacrifice
" also, is to be delayed until the Police Officer can
" be summoned. But what is the advantage of
" this? None are ever punished for performing an
" illegal sacrifice: and not informing the Police
" Officer has been declared no crime. We have
" now therefore the great satisfaction of knowing
" that many illegal Suttees are performed, whereas
" we were formerly ignorant whether they were
" legal or not."

The following is an extract from a letter written by one of the Chaplains of the E. I. Company to a Member of the British Parliament, dated Calcutta, 4th December, 1820.

" The Article about Suttees will present you
" with a well written and affecting account of the
" abominations which, notwithstanding all our im-
" provement in other respects, still abound among
" us—Oh! it is heart rending! and very distress-
" ing to us, who are near the evil, and hear and see
" things which, alas! we have no power to correct!
" Our Government has been wisely attentive to its
" relative duties towards the Natives of this Coun-
" try—But in this respect, its wisdom appears to the
" great body of judicious people amongst us, to be
" rather timidity, or even guilty apathy. It is no-
" torious that these abominable sacrifices might be

" stopped without exciting the least opposition, and " even with the general approbation of the natives, " yet we have in an evil hour sanctioned them, in " a manner, by pronouncing them legal if per- " formed under certain circumstances."

The following is an extract of a letter from the same individual, now resident in this country, dated 21st February, 1827 :—

" It is known to you, that some years ago the " Supreme Government interposed by a regulation, " which prohibited the burnings, *except in certain* " *cases*. This regulation, in fact, legalized the " Suttees. The prohibition acted but partially, for " in every instance almost, it was easy for the Brah- " mins and interested natives to secure all the re- " quisites necessary to make the burning legal. In " fact, the Government became by this regulation, " without intending it, *particeps criminis*. It " pronounced that to be legal (under certain cir- " cumstances) which ought never, under any cir- " cumstances, to be deemed legal by the parent " Government. If the Government interfere at " all, their interference should be used to abolish, " not to limit, or sanction, such an abomination.

" This I very strenuously maintained in argu- " ment with some persons who were *officially* con- " cerned in the regulation. The question has often " been asked, whether this regulation did in fact " increase the number of Suttees or diminish them? " On a deliberate review of the whole case, and " putting all the accounts together, I rest in the

" conviction that the number has been increased " rather than diminished. It was generally thought " to be on the increase when I left India, a twelve- " month since."

The last extract which I shall read on this head is from the letter of a gentleman who was a resident in Bengal in the Company's civil service, more than 25 years, and for seven years held the office there, of Accountant General; it is dated 14th March, 1827.

" I have witnessed a Suttee myself, and can " speak of these abominations from personal obser- " vation.

" With regard to the evil of the restrictive re- " gulation of 1812, respecting Suttees, I consider " it so great and lamentable as to require the ear- " liest possible redress. By that regulation, what " did the Bengal Government really do, but attempt " to separate, in the practice of Suttees, from hor- " rid suicides still more horrid murders? and, un- " happily, what was not distinctly prohibited in " those inhuman sacrifices, was not only delibe- " rately tolerated, but virtually declared, in the " judgment of the Government, to be unprohibit- " able, for it is not to be conceived that, in legislat- " ing on such a subject, all would not be done that " it was thought possible to do, for the utter sup- " pression of such abominations. As things now " stand, all the Suttees in Bengal—that is to say, " between 5 and 600 human sacrifices annually— " are each one sanctioned by the presence and ac-

"quiescence of the Police Officers of the British "Government!!! This evil, to the disgrace of our "Government, has now been going on, from year "to year, for fifteen years, and surely requires to "be put a stop to, without further delay.

"The Natives themselves have excluded Suttees "from the pale of the Hindoo religion; and so "much light has been thrown on this subject since "the year 1812, when the Restrictive Regulation "was framed, that Government need not be "ashamed to plead the want of information on "which it was founded as a reason for now rescind-"ing that Regulation."

Having thus adduced the decisive testimonies of many of the most competent local witnesses, as to the mischievous and injurious consequences of the Prohibitory Regulations, let us now refer to the details of the Nine years' Returns of these burnings, actually laid before the British Parliament: and here, were it not that the solemnity of the subject might appear to preclude all extrinsic embellishment, I would remind the Court, of language already familiar to them, and say,

> "I could a tale unfold, whose lightest word
> "Would harrow up thy soul."

Unhappily, however, we have not to deal with the fictions of poetry, but with the records of fact; and I shall now select from each year's Returns the more prominent instances of gross indifference, or

still grosser delinquency, on the part of the local authorities, and their agents.

Returns of 1815.

Suttees - - -	378
Children returned - -	196
Cases in which there are no returns of children - - - -	224

I have supposed each of the cases in which no Returns are made, to average one child, since each case actually reported, averages much more than two children, and I have therefore taken it at the lowest estimate. This would suppose 420 children in this year to be deprived of their only remaining, perhaps most valuable, parent.

In a multitude of instances (as noticed by the Legal Court) the Police were not informed until *after* the Suttee had taken place, and in others, were never informed at all. But there are no fewer than 224 cases out of 378 in which no single remark of any description is reported by the Magistrate beyond the names and ages of the parties, and dates of the Sacrifice; so that the whole object of the Returns is effectually defeated in those instances.*

Among the cases which *are* recorded, one is of a *married child of 14, one of a widow of 17, who re-*

* "The Court conclude that whenever no mention is made of the Police officers, they were not present." Vol. 3. p. 37. Let this remark be borne in mind throughout these Returns.

lented, from terror, after the flames had reached her, and escaped without mortal injury; while another case is mentioned of a woman of 20, who also escaped to her home after being partially burnt, where she died from the effects of the flames, after nine days suffering, in which case, as in so many others, no previous notice had been given to the police.

In this year six instances occur of widows of the Jogee tribe being burned alive with their husbands, which on subsequent reference to the Pundits, is declared contrary to the Hindoo law, but which still goes on through all the succeeding years without punishment, although illegal, as will be afterwards seen; and this notwithstanding the joint opinion of Mr. BIRD and Mr. RATTRAY, the two Judges of Dacca, dated 19th August, 1816, that "such a "custom ought to be put a stop to, from the answer "of the Pundit of this Court on the subject."—Vol. 1. p. 101.

In this year, a case occurs of a body being disinterred and burnt, and the widow burnt with it, the legality of which, was referred to the Pundits, who declare it a lawful act, according to the Shaster, which, however, the Legal Court doubt, as they reasonably might, on the Pundits own shewing elsewhere. In their remarks on the Returns of this year, the Legal Court propose a penalty for neglecting to give previous information of Suttees to the Police; but which, it is remarkable, was never adopted or confirmed, and therefore all parties from whom information might be derived are left to do as they

please, while it is clear that without such provision, the Regulations are a mockery.

Not one instance occurs of the prevention of a sacrifice by the interference of the police.

Returns of 1816.

Suttees	442
Children returned	266
Cases not returned	196

Taking each of the last to average one as before, this will make 462 children.

In a variety of recorded instances (as the Upper Court afterwards observe) the Police were not informed until after the Suttee had taken place, and in many others, were never informed at all. In 196 cases out of 442, not a single remark of any description is made, beyond names, ages, and dates, as before. Sometimes the Magistrates fine relations, or imprison them, for not giving information, or proceeding without the Police; but for this step they have no justification, and are constantly informed so, and censured for it, while no amount of punishment would compensate the sacrifice of life. In this year, seven, eight, and even ten children, are left behind by some widows who are sacrificed.

One case is of a wife of twelve years old, burnt with the privity of the Officer employed to hinder

it. The Magistrate says, he called for explanation, but it was "evasive and disingenuous," but no punishment follows. Another woman is partly burnt, and is taken home, where she expires. Another makes two attempts, but her courage failing, she is conveyed home, I suppose to die, but it is not stated.

In this, as in all the succeeding years, the cases of illegal post-cremation *(anoomarana,)* both of Brahmins' wives and others, who are not entitled to perform that sacrifice, occur incessantly. The Magistrate of Benares, after stating that "he had prevented two Suttees by force, without the slightest inconvenience," earnestly recommends the adoption of certain rules proposed by him in a letter of 23d July preceding, and complains that "No "notice whatever had yet been taken of it." This letter is also passed over in silence in the Returns of 1815.

From this year's Report, it appears that Suttees are not so frequent in the Bareilly District, since female child murder is there so common, that no Rajpoot allows a daughter to live; upon which the Court of Nizamut Adawlut afterwards declare child murder to be contrary to the existing law of 1804, and wish to know how this can have been evaded.—Vol. 1. p. 104.

Six cases occur, in this single year, of Sacrifices, all under the prescribed age of Sixteen; but nothing is done in consequence, except that the Ma-

gistrate is cautioned by the Legal Court to cause the officers to observe the Prohibitory Orders.

In this year, a woman of eleven years and eight months old is burnt, after two attempts to prevent it by a right-minded Englishman, who would have succeeded, had not Mr. Sage, the Magistrate of the district, permitted the burning, contrary to all law, as he himself afterwards admits, and for which he is *reprimanded* by the Governor General.—Vol. I. p. 45, et seq.

I cannot do better than quote the recorded opinion of Mr. Watson, the Judge, in his letter of 16th April, 1816, on transmitting these Returns to the Court of Nizamut Adawlut. His language is remarkably striking, and it applies alike to the Official Returns of every subsequent year.

"Several women," says he, "appear from "the Reports to have been *burnt without any* "*permission at all*, some in *direct violation of* "*the doctrines of the Hindoo religion*; and as "the Reports of the Police Darogahs in such "matters are not much to be trusted, it is very "probable that *this outrage on their own religion* "*may have been committed in most of the in-*"*stances of human destruction which these Re-*"*ports exhibit.*"—Vol. 1. p. 99.

Five cases appear in this year, of Suttees prevented, while 442 took place.

Returns of 1817.

Suttees	707
Children returned	187
Cases of Children not returned .	396

Taking each of the last, to average one, as before, this gives 583 children. The recorded instances of no previous information, and no punishment following, are numerous. In others, the Police either heard, or arrived, too late.

In 396 cases out of 707, no description of the actual circumstances of the case is attempted to be given, except as to the age, name, and date of burning. In two cases, where no previous notice had been given, the fine on offenders is ten rupees each, (£1. 5*s*. 0*d*.) In another, five rupees! In other cases of burning without notice, it is not said if *any* fine was levied; but perhaps it will be thought that there might as well be *none*, as five or ten rupees.

In one case, the Magistrate [of Dinagepore] coolly reports, that "the relatives had disposed of "this victim before the police could interfere;" but that the parties concerned "may in future "be induced to pause a little before action." But why they are thus to pause, or whether the pause is likely to be of any ultimate use, does not appear.

In one grossly illegal case, the father-in-law was examined, but discharged, "in consequence

"of extreme infirmity." Another father-in-law, is imprisoned six weeks; as are other parties, for longer terms. Another gross case of post-cremation occurs, in which no punishment is awarded; and this, though two infants were left. Suttees are again reported to be not frequent in Bareilly District, since they are chiefly Jauts and Rajpoots, who sacrifice all their daughters as infants.

In a gross case of post-cremation, and no previous notice, the Zemindars of the village give Bonds of indemnity in *fifty rupees*, not to offend again—equal to a £5. penalty against blood-shedding.

In another similar instance, no penal consequences are reported to have followed to any of the parties.

Fourteen Suttees are prevented—some as illegal: of these, one woman cried out to be rescued, after being severely burnt.

Two gross cases of post-cremation are followed by no punishment to the parties offending; and the Legal Court remark, with regret, on the Returns of this year, that the infliction of any punishment at all for giving no previous notice, is not warranted by the rules in force.

The Court observe [Vol. 1. p. 179.] upon the cases of no fewer, in this single year, than eight women of only Sixteen, besides six whose ages were not ascertained; while they notice that Twenty-four

mothers were burnt, each leaving children under three years of age; and they now régret (after sanctioning it before, on the Pundits' opinions) that any women having infant children should be suffered to burn, while (I quote their own words) "one indisputable authority of Hindoo law declares that the "mother of an infant child may not relinquish the "care of her infant to ascend the pile; and a single Commentator only, whose comment is authoritative only in Bengal, has inferred, that if the "infant is maintained by any other person, in that "case the mother is entitled to follow her deceased "husband." It is melancholy, that with this before them, two years preceding, they should have sanctioned such a practice as allowing these wretched infants to be provided for, upon Bonds, (often of strangers,) which never were, and never could be, enforced.

Two women, of ten and twelve years of age, are burnt in this year, and the Magistrates of Goruckpore and Ghazeepore gave no information respecting them.

Mr. Chapman, the Magistrate of Jessore, writing with his Returns, says, "That no single in-"stance has occurred in his District wherein the "interference of the Police has prevented the pro-"ceeding of the Sacrifice."—Vol. 1. p. 177.

The Law Court observe the numbers of this third year of the new Rules, considerably to exceed the number in each of the two preceding,

being in 1815, - - -	378
in 1816, - - -	442
and in 1817, - - -	707

but hope it may be owing to greater vigilance in reporting what took place in 1817, so that if that view be correct, the Returns of 1815 and 1816 cannot be relied on, since all that actually then took place could not in such case have been reported.—Vol. 1. p. 177.

Returns of 1818.

Suttees - - - - - -	839
Children returned - - -	183
Cases of Children not returned	534

This, on the former average, would give 717 Children.

This is the worst year hitherto, in respect of the absence of previous notice to the Police, and the indifference with which the grossest cases of cruelty and illegality are treated, both by the Magistrates, and the Court above.

A variety of cases where no previous notice had been given, escape without censure or remedy.

In 534 cases out of 839, no account whatever, of the actual case is given, so that we are left to the wildest conjecture as before, except, in so far as the age, caste, name and date of the burning appear.

Two cases under age—each of FIFTEEN—occur, for allowing one of which, the Officer is simply *reprimanded,* and in the other, escapes without even this notice.

In another case, where no previous notice had been given, a Bond in the penalty of 25 rupees is taken from the friends, as it is said "for their future guidance!" that is, security of about 3*l.* that they should not burn any other friend without giving previous notice of their intentions to the Police, which would, in all probability, never have hindered it, if they had. It is, however, most observable, that the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, afterwards say, that even this insufficient security ought not to have been given by the friends, who were not strictly called upon to give previous notice at all!

Four cases occur of burying alive by the Jogee caste, though positively prohibited before, under the plainest sanctions.

The Return of Beerbhoom, in Moorshedabad, says, that two widows retracted, on persuasion from their friends, but that the Magistrates and Police Officers prevented none.

In a case of no notice previously given, a Relation makes his escape, and the village Pasban receives fifteen Rattans, other Pasbans have twenty-five Rattans, another offender escapes punishment from old age; and some parties have short imprisonments for the grossest misconduct, while even these imprisonments are afterwards declared illegal

by the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, as no law compelled notice to be given, (Vol. 1. p. 224.) They also add, that the Proprietors of villages ought not to have been fined, but they congratulate themselves that these fines can be refunded! (Vol. 1. p. 225.) A solemn mockery.

In another illegal case, the Relation absconded, and in one, both the Pasban and Relation did so. In another, the Relation did not appear.

In a case where the Concubine of the deceased is burnt, the Officer is fined about 6*l.* of our money, the price of life! and there immediately follow burnings where the fine is twenty rupees, (2*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.*) and ten rupees (1*l.* 5*s.* 0*d.*) so that life is here set at a much lower rate, but even *these* fines are afterwards declared by the Legal Court, (Vol. 1. p. 225.) to be improper, and such as cannot be justified.

Another most irregular case, of which no previous notice had been given, escapes all punishment whatever; and one case occurs, on which the following record appears:—"The Relation of the "deceased, and village Zemindar and Watchman "were summoned; they denied, *as usual*, all con-"cern with the case," and this seems to have satisfied the Magistrate.

A case of a burning at twelve years of age occurs, and is left under enquiry, of which, however, no more is said.

In another case of illegal burning, the Magistrate says, "the Zemindars and Watchmen, on their "appearance, denied, *as usual*, all knowledge of

"the subject," and there he leaves it; but the Court of Nizamut Adawlut afterwards think he had gone too far, while no body else will think he went far enough, for they condemn the attempt to call them to account at all.—Vol. 1. p. 226.

Another case occurs (p. 211) of gross irregularity on the part of an Officer, in which there is no satisfactory explanation, and no recorded punishment; and yet the Legal Court are afterwards tender enough to "hope that no unnecessary severity has "been used towards him," though he evidently had it in his power to prevent a Sacrifice which that same Court holds to be, as it was, most irregular.

Only 11 cases beyond the 839 Sacrifices appear to have been prevented, six of these by persuasion, and five by authority. Three Judges state, that in almost every instance in one District (Shahabad) in this year, the burnings took place without any previous notice to the Officers of police.—Vol. 1. p. 218.

The Court of Nizamut Adawlut, notwithstanding the peculiarly aggravated character of the cases of this year; the want of all notice in such a multitude of instances; the acknowledged increase beyond all former years; and even their own admission in this same Report, first, that they "doubt "whether the Regulations have not rather been "attended with a contrary effect than the one con-"templated;" and secondly, that "they fear the "practice has been rather inflamed than repressed

" by the interference of the public authorities," are yet content to report to the Supreme Government, " that they are not prepared to recommend that " the rules" (of Restrictive Regulation) " should " be done away."

Returns of 1819.

Suttees - - - -	650
Children returned - - -	286
Cases of Children not returned	400

Following the former estimate, this would leave 686 Children without a Mother—Of these 650 Sacrifices, no fewer than 421 occurred in the districts of the Calcutta Division alone. In this as in former Reports, the instances of no previous notice to the Police, or none arriving in time for them to attend, are numerous, while, in no fewer than 400 instances out of 650, no single observation whatever is given to indicate the particular circumstances of the case, or whether legal or illegal in its nature (with the exception of name, age, caste, and date of burning.)

The Law Court afterwards conclude (Vol. 2. p. 56.) very charitably that, as the Magistrate of the entire District of Burdwan has made no remark on any one of his 75 cases, they were all within the existing rules and exposition of the law given by the Pundits, and promulgated by the Court Orders, but upon the 325 cases of the whole remaining Districts, which are equally without any

Magistrate's remark, they record no such charitable inference, as either not feeling that it could apply, or unwilling to revolt the Indian and British public by so absurd a supposition.

Among the cases which *are* recorded is one of a wife of eight years old burnt, [I do not call her a *widow.*]

In another, where no notice was given, the son was imprisoned ten days, but the Legal Court afterwards treat this as an undue exercise of authority, which, in fact, was the case. It therefore is not quoted against the Court, but to shew the folly of the system.

Twelve cases occur of burying alive by the Jogee tribe, which are positively illegal, but nothing is done. In one illegal burning, the offenders are *reprimanded and released.*

In another, admitted to be one of "total disregard to the regular orders," a fine of *one rupee* is levied on the principal offender, and a smaller still, on others. It is very striking that an engagement for the future support of two children under age was required by the Magistrate after the burning, as it was impossible to do it before, upon which, he is informed by the Legal Court [Vol. 2. p. 29.] that if this engagement was *not voluntary* he ought not to have required it; a gross decision, since even they must admit that it might have been required before the burning, and that the Magistrate's only chance of saving the children from perishing was to act not quite legally.

One case of no previous notice occurs, though only ¼ coss distant from the Police, and another of insufficient notice, where the Native officer deputes two Brahmins, who, of course, take care to arrive after the woman is burnt.

Two women, each only twelve years of age, are burnt, upon whose sacrifices Mr. MILLET, the Magistrate, expressly reports that they were each done agreeably to the Shaster, though he could not but know the Regulations. The Law Court content themselves with requesting further information, which it does not appear was ever received, and if it was, the women had been burnt.

Several cases of illegal post-cremation occur, without punishment following.

In a burning at the age of thirteen, the Magistrate says, he has instituted enquiry, but no result is reported.

The Law Court coolly record that they are sorry to observe that the three widows of one Brahmin burned themselves.

Four cases are recorded as having been prevented from burning while 650 took place. It is the more remarkable, that neither the Legal Court nor the Governor General in Council in observing upon this Report on the 14th July, 1820, make any observation on the 400 cases transmitted without official information, although the Court in particular had, in former years strongly remarked on, and repeatedly condemned, similar cases of omission, even when they were much less numerous; a plain proof that

they were both compelled to avert their eyes from the consequences of their own legislation.

Under this year may perhaps be noticed, a circumstance occurring in the Returns of the Southern Concan [Bombay] where in consequence of Mr. PELLY, the Magistrate of that district having reported to the Governor in Council [Mr. ELPHINSTONE] that one Suttee had been prevented by a Lieutenant, another by a Magistrate, and a third, by somebody else, some alarm appears to be excited in consequence, and "the Governor in Council desires that "Mr. PELLY will not interfere in the performance "of such sacrifices, except in the mildest mode of "persuasion."—Vol. 4. p. 159.

What, I would ask, can be expected or hoped for, under Orders of this character, and what destructive consequences must not inevitably follow from such discouragement to acting Magistrates desirous of promoting the best interests of India?

Returns of 1820.

Suttees - - - -	597
Children returned - -	213
Cases of Children not returned -	296

The Children in this year, would, on the former average, amount to 509.

Here, as before, the cases are numerous indeed, where no notice, or insufficient notice, defeat all pretence of superintendance. In 203 cases out of

597, no statement whatever is given beyond the names, ages, castes, and dates. In one illegal case of non-age, (only 14,) the Darogah is *reprimanded* by the Magistrate for allowing it, and enjoined to be *more careful in future*; but even this slight notice satisfies the Legal Court, who afterwards observe, (Vol. 2, p. 56,) that "the case "attracted the particular notice and orders of the "Magistrate, with the view of preventing a simi-"lar occurrence in future"—a statement which is in no way warranted by his own Return, viz. that all he did, was to *reprimand* the Darogah, and enjoin *him* to be more careful in future, without inflicting any punishment on him, or adopting any such precautions for the future as the Court represent.

In another case of non-age, (15,) no notice is taken.

In this year, we find 93 cases, lumped together; and the Darogahs are stated to have reported, that, in all of them, the Sacrifice took place agreeably to the Shaster; which has the air of stamping so many bales of goods with an official Permit.

Eight Widows are buried alive, (Jogees,) but no punishment follows.

Two Infants are left, and no bond given.

In another case of non-age, (15,) without previous notice, the Magistrate [of Shahabad] states, there was no legal disability, as if unacquainted with his own laws.

In a gross case of illegal post-cremation, the

Gornet of the village, and others, are sent for, but as usual discharged.

In one case, where the Police was not informed till two days afterwards, and two infants were left, the Magistrate [of Shahabad] says, it *escaped his memory* for some months; but, at last, on investigation, it appeared that the Children were not too young for the Sacrifice to take place—that is, were over three years of age.

In another case, the Widow was reported to have died of *grief*, but it was evidently a Suttee; no notice, however, having been given to the Police, they could report no circumstances attending it.

In another, the Farmers of the village are fined 10 Rupees each, (something better than £1. sterling,) for actually *preventing* information of a burning being given.

In one of the many cases where no previous notice had been given, the Magistrate says, it was "*as usual*, without notice;" so that this must be taken, on the best evidence, as a common occurrence in 1820, the sixth year of the operation of the law, expressly requiring Notice, as essential to any good to be ever hoped for from the Regulations.

Another case is of an illegal post-cremation before the arrival of the police, in which the grossest contradiction and suppression of fact prevailed, but no punishment followed.

In a case, where no information was given for 18 days, when it was declared that the woman

had died of grief; but where there was no doubt of her being burnt—no punishment followed.

A case of illegal post-cremation, in which the Darogah never went to the spot—is fined 20 Rupees, (£2. 10s. 0d.) but there can be little doubt that he was much better paid than this, for staying away. Another, of a similar nature, escapes punishment altogether.

Another case occurs of full previous information being given to the Native Police, and military; but there is no interference, and the Darogah is absent on a local inquiry; no punishment however follows.

A case of gross illegality occurs in a woman, living in open adultery during her husband's life, with another man, and burning on the pile of the Adulterer. Notice was sent to a Native officer, who chose to be absent; and the Darogah was away on local inquiries. One of these parties was dismissed.

Another is stated of a woman burning with the man she cohabited with—the husband still surviving, but having previously divorced her—no punishment.

A case of a woman burning with the corpse of her *son*, 16 years after the husband's death: illegal as it was—is followed by no punishment.

In one District Report, the Magistrate expressly complains of "the neglect and inattention of the Officers."

In an illegal case of post-cremation, of which previous notice was given, the Magistrate prohibits it; but receives information that, before his

Order could arrive, the Sacrifice took place. No punishment is awarded.

Another case occurs without previous notice, and where an infant is unprovided for; but no punishment follows.

In a single page, 23 cases occur without previous notice; upon which the Magistrate [of Ghazeepore] coolly observes—"the practice of "burning, before notice is given to the Police, "seems very prevalent in this District;" but with this observation he seems to suppose he has discharged his duty, and released his conscience.

A case of non-age, (15,) meets with no punishment.

An atrocious case occurs, in a Widow of 14, (Musumut Hoomuleea) who flies from the pile, and is murdered. It is thus described by Mr. RATTRAY, the Judge of Goruckpore:—"the pile was fired by her "uncle; the agony was soon beyond endurance, and "she leaped from the flames; but, seized by her "uncle, and others, she was taken up by the hands "and feet, and again thrown upon it; much burnt, "and her clothes quite consumed, she again sprung "from the pile, and running to a well hard by, "laid herself down in the watercourse, weeping "bitterly. Her uncle now took a sheet, offered "for the occasion by another party, and spreading "it on the ground, desired her to seat herself upon "it. 'No,' she said, 'she would not do this—he "would carry her again to the fire, and she could "not submit to this; she would quit the family,

" and live by beggary—any thing, if they would " have mercy upon her. Her uncle upon this, " swore by the Ganges, that if she would seat " herself on the cloth, he would carry her to her " home. She did so—they bound her up in it— " sent for a bamboo, which was passed through " the loops formed by tying it together, and carry- " ing it thus to the pile, now fiercely burning, " threw it into the flames. The cloth was imme- " diately consumed, and the wretched victim once " more made an effort to save herself, when, at the " instigation of the rest, a Mussulman approached " near enough to reach her with his sword, and " cutting her through the head, she fell back, and " was released from further trial, by death." Vol. 2. p. 67.

Six prisoners were put on their trial for this foul murder. When it first came on, it was postponed, because the offenders alleged that the witnesses were inimical to them—a common ground of defence in India.

At length the Court of Nizamut Adawlut decide on the case as follows: " Making allowance " for the superstitious prejudices of the Hindoos " concerned, and for the ignorance of the Maho- " medans, the Court do not discern in any of them " the guilt of murder, and viewing the case as one " of culpable homicide—sentence," &c. adjudging one to imprisonment, with labour, for five years: another to ditto, for three years; and four to imprisonment without labour, for two years; all which

was in defiance of Mr. RATTRAY, the Judge's opinion, as under.

"I verily believe I only echo the wishes and ex-
"pectations of nineteen-twentieths of even the
"Hindoos of this community, when I urge death
"as the requital of this atrocity. In justice, all the
"prisoners should be equally condemned to this
"atonement, but the example may be deemed suf-
"ficient, if extended only to the three first. If so,
"the others should certainly be sentenced to im-
"prisonment for life in banishment.

"There never was, and never can be a more
"crying occasion for example, and never can be
"subjects entitled to less sympathy than these con-
"victed monsters.

"I leave them to the disposal of the Court,
"without the power or desire of interposing one
"plea in mitigation of that punishment, which it
"would be a false and erring feeling, to wish to
"shield them from."—Vol. 2. p. 66.

I have been informed by a gentleman then resident in India, that even these mitigated sentences of imprisonment were afterwards commuted for labour on the roads—a circumstance which, if correct, could not fail to produce the worst results in a case more atrocious and aggravated in all its parts than was likely to be brought forward again. I hope for the interests of humanity that he may have been misinformed.

The remaining cases of this detail may be ranked under—

A case where a child of four months' old is left without bond for maintenance—no punishment.

A post-cremation of Brahmin's widow, with no previous notice—no punishment.

Six cases appear beyond the 597 actual Sacrifices, in which, from some circumstances, the Sacrifice was prevented, by the interposition of the Police.

It is remarkable that in the summary of the Legal Court upon this year's returns, they observe very charitably as before upon the district of Burdwan, containing this year 75 sacrifices, no one of which is described by the Magistrate, that "they conclude "they were within the existing rules and exposi- "tions of the law as given by the Pundits," but do not tell us what they conclude about the 128 remaining cases, which are equally without explanation of any description.

The Governor General in Council, remarking by letter to the Court of Directors (dated 19th Dec. 1822) upon the small decrease in the two years, 1819 and 1820, as compared with the two preceding years of 1817 and 1818, (but without noticing the very great increase which had taken place in 1817 and 1818 beyond the years 1815 and 1816,) observes, "We have not sufficient means of esti- "mating the causes which have operated in pro- "ducing the more favourable results in 1819 and "1820." So that the Government do not attempt to refer the decrease to the Prohibitory Regulations. Vol. 3. p. 1.

Returns of 1821.

Suttees - - -	654
Children returned - - -	236
Cases of Children not returned -	313

The Children, on the former average would be 549.

As in each former year, the cases are very numerous, in which, either no previous notice of the Sacrifice is given at all, or none in sufficient time to ensure the attendance of the Police.

In 313 cases out of 654, no Return whatever is made by the resident Magistrates beyond names, ages, castes, and dates of burning. The tenderness with which the Court observe in this year as before, on these omissions, is wholly subversive of their own professed design in the adoption of the Regulations. "In the district of Hooghly" (say they) "95 Suttees have happened during the year "The Court *conclude that they were all legal* "but from the total want of explanation, there exists a slight degree of uncertainty on this point "It does not appear whether the Officers of police "were present, or not, at any of these Sacrifices." But the same charitable conclusion must be adopted by them as to the remaining 218 cases of no Returns, besides the 95 of Hooghly; and what then becomes of the Rules for superintending these awful spectacles?

The cases which *are* noticed, present the following:—

One illegal case of post-cremation, without punishment.

Another, without waiting for the Magistrate's permission, the punishment for which is, that an offending party gives bond to appear in Court *when required*, which he might do, with great safety to his personal comfort.

A case of non-age (under 14) without waiting for any Officer. The Magistrate awarded no punishment, and says that no law had declared against it.

Another gross case occurring in Cuttack district, the Magistrate says, "was attended with a circum-"stance which it may be proper to mention." And will it be believed that this "circumstance" is, that on the victim stretching out her hands to the side of the burning pit, a party who had the management of the ceremony "gave her a push or blow "with a bamboo, which tumbled her into the hot-"test part of the fire. The above facts," (says the Magistrate,) "appeared on the investigation before "me, but he was released, as I am not aware that "he was guilty of any *legal crime:* his object "seems to have been merely to expedite the cere-"mony as much as possible."

The charitable construction thus put, by authority, upon this disgraceful case, reminds us of Mr. BURKE's allusion to those "gentle genealogists—"the Heralds—who dip their pens only in the milk "of human kindness;" but alas! the official kindness here exercised, extends only to the perpetrators of crime, but not to the victims of it.

Upon this case, however, the Court of Nizamut Adawlut find virtue enough afterwards to observe [Vol. 3, p. 34] that the chief offender might have been punished as for *a misdemeanour*, and that it had been better there should have been no investigation, than that he should have escaped altogether after conviction.

Two widows are burned contrary to law, but no one is punished in consequence.

In one case, a woman flies from fear, is dreadfully burnt, and dies in less than a month.

Another case is grossly illegal. The friends are summoned by a Magistrate—the answer was that they were from home, but should be sent. Another summons follows, but with no better result.

In another post-cremation case of gross irregularity, the Police Officer had the grace to take Security to appear, from the Relation who fired the Pile, if he should be called for; and the Magistrate on his appearance, ordered him to be set at liberty

In another case of irregularity, an offender is imprisoned three months (but without labor or irons for not giving timely notice of the Suttee, which was that of a Brahmin's wife twelve years after her husband's death, yet the Court cashier this Magistrate [vol 3. p. 37.] for acting so severely for "the omission" (as they call it) "to furnish timely information"—whereas the fact was, that the punishment was not merely for furnishing no notice, but for practising a grossly illegal Suttee.

Another is a case of Friends alleging that when

they were intending to inform the Police, the fire broke out upon the Widow of itself, upon which, they supplied the required wood. This defence, as if it had been believed, is followed by no punishment.

The age of another victim, after the Sacrifice, is returned by some, as only 12, by others as above the permitted age—further information is sent for, but does not appear ever to have arrived—indeed it is of no great consequence.

Several illegal cases occur of Post-cremation, and otherwise, without previous notice, but for none of which is any punishment awarded.

In one gross case, where a woman of the Brahmin caste is both under age, and unmarried, and no information was given, a Relation is made to give Security to take his trial, but of which, no more appears.

Of two cases admitted to be illegal, not a word is said as to the Offenders in one—in the other the Officer was *reprimanded.*

In a case which took place before the Police arrived, the parties were sent for trial, but the Legal Court afterwards disapproved of this, though it seems lenient enough.—[Vol 3. p. 38.]

One victim escapes, after the fire had reached her, upon which her Relations tried to force her into the flames—one offender was sent to trial, but no result is stated.

In some cases where no information had been previously given, the Magistrate ventured to impose fines, some of the low amount of 20 and 40 Rupees

(£2. 10*s.* 0*d.* and £5. 0*s.* 0*d.*) but the Court afterwards declare [vol. 3, p. 39.] that this is contrary to law, and the fines must be immediately returned, and the Magistrate is never to act so again.

Another woman escapes very much burnt, and dies in two days—no punishment.

In one particularly gross case of Post-cremation of a Brahmin's wife, under age, the Legal Court condemn the Magistrate, asserting he had no right to send the Relations to trial, because, though under age, and a Brahmin's wife burning apart from her husband's pile, yet it is not stated to have been involuntary on her part, or that her relations used any improper means—a decision which almost goes the length of absolving all parties from punishment in any case short of absolute compulsion or violence, while those cases are as invariably treated with the utmost lenity also.

A case of a victim at Goruckpore (Mussumut Busuntea) who when she felt the flames, implored help, but none was afforded: she then leaped from the Pile, and her Relations forcibly replaced her—she again jumped off, and was a second time replaced on the flames, and there detained till she was consumed. The Cotwal of the town looked on, without interfering, although even a Mahometan called upon him to interpose, but in vain. In this flagrant case, all the Prisoners were acquitted by the Judge of Circuit; the only pretence for which acquittal was, that the witnesses for the prosecution were at enmity with the Cotwal; but the Magistrate who

sent them for trial (Mr. BIRD) says " as I received " my information immediately after the occurrence, " and from persons of different creeds, and castes, " and professions, who could have had no common " motive to falsify or deceive, I must still believe " that the poor victim was *foully murdered*, and the " Cotwal an abettor in the perpetration of the crime." See Vol. 4, p. 5.

Four cases of burnings occur under age (viz. 12, 13, 14 and 14) but without a single remark upon them.

In another illegal case of a Brahmin's Wife, by Post-cremation—no notice is taken of the illegality.

The Legal Court in observing [Vol. 3, p. 40.] that out of forty-four cases in the District of Goruckpore, only one has a single remark of any kind made upon it, by the Magistrate, add that " he will be " desired to be *more particular in future*," but every Magistrate had been enjoined to this same duty annually for the preceding six years.

The Court find that fifty-seven more perished this year than the last.

Only nine are saved out of 654 by the Police.

The nine instances out of 654 which appear to have been saved by retraction of the vow, or by prevention of the Police, afford matter of congratulation to the constituted authorities—but it does not seem to be considered, that probably the greater number of those who perished, are to be referred to the sanction afforded, by the Government Regulations, to the performance of the Rite.

One of those who fled from the Pile perished in two days, from the burns, which would reduce the number to eight.—Vol. 3, p. 43.

Returns of 1822.

Suttees - - - -	583
Children returned - -	536
Cases of Children not returned -	41

The Children, as on the former average, would thus amount to 577.

The instances, this year, of want of all previous notice to the Police, are, as usual, very numerous, as are those of no attendance, either from no notice having been sent, or from its arriving too late. The cases, however, which are destitute of any observation upon them, are much less numerous in this year.

Among the cases recorded, are

Two, where no previous notice was given, but where the burning is said to have taken place in the presence of "the respectable inhabitants of the neighbourhood."

Two cases of non-age, (13 and 15,) without any remark, or punishment.

In 50 cases which occur in Nuddea District, and 43 in the Calcutta ditto, the Magistrates of neither, state, whether a single Officer was present at any one; but the Law Court, as before, very charitably say they conclude that they *were* present at

all—not indeed that it signifies in the least, whether they were, or not.

In a case of no notice, the parties are *reprimanded.*

In all the Districts of Cuttack, Balasore, and Khoordah (28 in number) with the exception of three cases of recorded absence, the Magistrates say not a word of the attendance of any Police officer; to which the same remark applies as before.

Two cases of Jogees buried alive—illegal—but no censure from the Law Court, afterwards.

A Child of two years old, is left without notice of any Security for its maintenance being taken.

The whole Return of the Magistrate of Rungpore, is declared by the Court, (Vol. 4, p. 78,) to be so perfectly unintelligible to them, that the English readers may be, perhaps, excused for not attempting to understand it; and the like remark applies to a Return from the Magistrate of Bundlecund, of which they predicate the same.

In a case of non-age, (14,) the Father is committed for trial, but, as usual, acquitted.

In a case of illegal Suttee, another Father is tried for firing the pile of his own daughter, and is afterwards sentenced to seven years imprisonment.

In many Returns it is said, that "the Officer did "not arrive in time to save her;" conveying an inference which will neither be believed in India, nor England, that if he had arrived in time, he *would* have saved the victim.

Seven illegal cases occur, with no Police attendance, and no punishment in either; in these cases of absence, it is admitted by the Magistrates that most of the villages were not distant from the Police stations.

In a case of non-age, where the widow was 12, and the husband 15, no notice was given till after the Sacrifice, and no punishment followed.

In three cases, which the Magistrate admits must be considered illegal on the statements of their own friends, he says, he is inclined to think they might have been legal.

In a case at Bareilly, the Magistrate makes a reference to the Law Court, five months after the burning; but they report upon such reference as unnecessary, and coolly refer him to his Orders.—Vol. 4. p. 81.

In one illegal case, the parties are examined, and released, as usual. In another, the case is sent to the Judge of Circuit, but no result appears.

In a case of no notice, the Relation who fired the pile (presumed to be the son) is released on giving Security not to do so again; that is, not to burn another Mother.

In a case of burning, under circumstances of insanity, the Relations are summoned, but do not appear, and that is all.

In one case, the Officer reports, (as elsewhere,) that the widow's clothes ignited of themselves, which is duly repeated by the Magistrate.

In another plainly illegal case, the Relations

plead ignorance of the law, on which, they are, as usual, discharged. What does the Magistrate say to the maxim of "Ignorantia legis non excusat." But this is the same gentleman who reports the story of the clothes igniting, per se.

An awful case of a woman of thirty being burnt, having three children living, and being two months gone with child. The Darogah is fined twelve rupees, or £1. 10*s*. 0*d*., and the Jemadar, three rupees, or 7*s*. 6*d*.; and these are the prices of two lives!

One case of a burning, reported to have taken place, after the departure of the Police; whose Instructions, however, are "to remain on the spot "till all is concluded."

In a grossly illegal case, the parties are discharged, as usual. In two others, they are discharged on Bail for appearance.

One is stated as prevented by the Police, in which the woman "died suddenly, half an hour af-"terwards."

A case of a woman of twenty-five, leaving an Infant of six months old, *who died by starvation.* No uncommon case in India, though the only one that appears officially returned.

In two cases of non-age, (twelve and fourteen,) the parties are committed for trial, but no result is reported.

In all the forty-seven cases of Ghazeepore (most of whom were in the prime of life) only ten had previous notice given to the Police.

Seventeen cases are prevented from burning, beyond the 583 actually sacrificed. The Court of Nizamut Adawlut, in observing, on 4th July, 1823, upon these Returns of 1822, is so unduly jealous of any prevention of the practice *by authority*, that a Magistrate who only prevented two Suttees for a time, until certain disqualifying circumstances were removed, which interference eventually saved both these women—is told, that he ought only "to have "noted the fact of their retractation, without stat-"ing the reasons for it."

The Law Court admit, as late as 1823, when the Regulations had been in force above eight years, that no existing law renders previous notice to the Police necessary, or makes the withholding it, punishable by fine or imprisonment; but they hold, that where the provisions under which the burning is allowed, have not been complied with; that is, where the burning is illegal, the Relations or Abettors are *liable* to punishment *in the discretion of the Magistrate*, who is however at the same time informed, that illegal practices are more likely to be checked by the vigilance and interposition of the Police, than by any subsequent penalties on the offending parties.—Vol. 4. p. 79.

Returns of 1823.

Suttees	575
Children returned	627

In this year, as before, repeated instances occur

of no notice having been given before the performance of the Sacrifice, or such insufficient notice as is said to have rendered any attendance of the Police, in sufficient time for the purpose of prevention or superintendance, impossible.

Of forty-five cases in the District of Burdwan, the Magistrate never specifies whether the Police attended in any one. The Law Court, however, with all tenderness, request him to supply the omission in his further Reports.

In the cases which *are* reported, the following occur:

In one, which took place without the knowledge of the Police, the Relations are *reprimanded.*

One Brahmin has four widows burnt on his pile, all under the age of forty; and these are four out of twenty-one widows of the same man. Where is the Religion of this frightful Sacrifice?

"A decent Priest, where Monkeys were the Gods."

One is the case of a widow being dissuaded by an Englishman, who is said to have "happened to be there."

In all the twenty-seven burnings which took place in the District of Jungle Mehals, the account of no one Sacrifice is stated, nor whether any one of them, had a Police Officer present at the time. The Legal Court, however, as usual, say, "they presume they were *all legal.*"

Three Sacrifices are recorded as having taken place without notice; in two of which, the reason assigned for no notice having been given—is, that

the weather was bad, which circumstance however did not hinder the burning from taking place.

In the whole forty-six cases occurring in the suburbs of Calcutta, not a single one is described, whether it was of the nature of con-cremation or post-cremation; nor does it appear that the Police was present at any one of them. The Legal Court content themselves with desiring the Magistrate to conform, in future, to their orders.

In one case, occurring in the District of Cuttack, where no previous notice was given, the Son, and others, alledge ignorance of the law, which is received as a sufficient vindication, and they are *reprimanded!*

In an illegal case of non-age [14], the Relations and Police Officer declare, with one consent, that they were wholly ignorant of the law; on which the Magistrate discharges them, as all blameless, and the Law Court afterwards declares his remarks to be "full and satisfactory to the Court." They turn upon the alledged fact of *no copy of the laws* having been in the District since 1817, when they were burnt by the Coojung rebels. But is it to be believed, that in a District where nineteen Suttees had taken place in that single year, besides all those which had happened in former years, it should not have been a matter of public notoriety, that women of fourteen could not be legally burnt. But besides this, it was not left to public notoriety, for it so happens that only in the year 1822, the Court of Nizamut

Adawlut had remarked specially on a case of illegal sacrifice of a girl of the same age [fourteen], in this same District of Cuttack, which occurred during the year 1821. Consequently the Magistrate was bound to have then recopied the Order which he now says, the District was without. It also happens, that in the year 1819, the Law Court again remark specially [See Vol. I. p. 222] on no less than two different cases of non-age (both aged fifteen) in this same District of Cuttack; and the Court add very remarkably, that the Magistrate had observed to them in his defence, that "having reason to believe that the Rules in "force on the subject were not sufficiently known "in the District, he had recently directed their "republication, accompanied by a translation in "the Oorecah language."

All this completely overthrows the reasoning of the Magistrate for releasing the Offenders in the case of non-age in 1823; namely, that the District was without knowledge of the Law, upon which plea of ignorance on the part of the Offenders, he is justified by the Legal Court for discharging the parties; the Court having evidently forgotten their former complaints, and the Magistrate's recorded answer to them.

If this Magistrate were not the same Individual in 1823 with the one presiding in Cuttack in 1819, and 1821, still the Rules would have remained, which were supplied in 1819, two years after the

period when the old Rules are said to have been burnt by the Coojung rebels. If the Magistrate were the same, no one will envy him his responsibility, since, in that case, he would have released Offenders in 1819 upon a plea, the justice of which, his own knowledge and memory would have enabled him to refute.

It is possible this may be the same Gentleman, who in the year 1821 refused to punish a man in the District of Cuttack, who (he says) by a push or blow with a bamboo, was proved to have thrust a wretched victim into the hottest part of the flames, for which this Magistrate was afterwards censured by the Court, though he had alledged, that for any thing he knew, the man might only have intended "to expedite the ceremony as much as "possible;"—that is, to have committed Murder with dispatch.

Case of a widow having quitted the fire and made her escape; which the Magistrate [of Khoordah] says, "as the Sacrifice was not compleated, he "thinks *it may be proper to mention,*"—the case being no other than this, that (to use his own words) "she threw herself into the burning pit, "where the body of her husband was consuming, "but immediately leaped out, and made her "escape. She was severely, but not dangerously "burnt"—such is the case which he thinks it may be *proper to mention!*

In a case where no name or age is reported, and

which took place without the knowledge of the Police, the Relations were summoned, but the Darogah says—they have absconded.

Two cases of an illegal burying alive, in neither of which, the Police are reported to have been present.

A case reported in which the Police *happened to be absent.*

Case of a Widow's escape from the pile, after being burnt in different parts. The Magistrate reports, that in two days, "she died *a natural death,* "probably from the burns she had received," in which case, most persons will agree in thinking that it was *not* a natural death.

A grossly illegal case of non-age (fourteen) on the part of a Brahmin's widow, by post-cremation The offending parties, it seems, were tried, but in consequence of a difference of opinion in the Judge and his Law Officers, the case was sent to the Superior Court of Nizamut Adawlut, who only award six months' imprisonment, but without labor or irons.

Case of no previous notice in which the parties on being called to account for it, are said to have made their escape, and no more is heard of them.

In one case the Widow is reported by the Magistrate to have "met her fate *with cheerfulness,*" while, in another, the Widow is said to have "burnt herself with her husband *of her good will,*" after

which, the Magistrate is complimented by the Law Court for his "very satisfactory information."

Two cases of illegal post-cremation without previous notice; one of a Brahmin's wife, but no punishment in either.

An illegal case of non-age (twelve) not known till four months after—no punishment.

Four more illegal cases of post-cremation—no punishment.

Two illegal cases without punishment.

Gross case of non-age (fourteen) by post-cremation, of a Brahmin's wife, and no attendance of Police. One offender is said to have been punished, but not how; from other specimens, we may suppose, in the fine of a few rupees.

Illegal case of no previous notice to, and no attendance of, Police. The testimony contradictory and equivocal; proceedings are said to be in progress, but no result appears.

Case of illegal post-cremation of a Brahmin's widow, five years after his death—no punishment.

Another case of a similar nature, with the like result.

In another illegal case, the parties are discharged by the superior Court of Nizamut Adawlut.

In a case of a Return from the Magistrate of Cawnpore, in February, the Legal Court say they cannot understand it; and, therefore, parties in England may be excused for not doing so, and the same

observation applies to two other cases from the Magistrate of Seharumpore, in May, to which the Court equally return an *Ignoramus.*

A case of a woman quitting the burning pile from terror, who is said to have subsequently thrown herself into a well, and been drowned.

All the four cases from the district of Bhetôra are afterwards declared by the Law Court to be so defective in the statement, as to leave it impossible to be understood whether they were legal or illegal; not indeed, that the distinction is of very great importance. No Police appear to have been present.

Case of illegal post-cremation of a Brahmin's wife, and no Police present. The punishment is *one month's imprisonment, without labour.*

One woman of eighteen left a child *six days* old, and no Officer present. The Magistrate [of Ghazeepore] says, "The Heirs of the deceased "pleaded ignorance, and were released."

Eight different cases are gravely recorded, as on former occasions, where the Magistrates report that the clothes of the widow were said to have ignited of themselves!

Two grossly illegal cases of post-cremation by Brahmin's wives, in one of which, no punishment is recorded; in the other, the Offenders plead ignorance of the law, and, as usual, have their plea fully admitted.

In a case of the post-cremation of a Brahmin's widow, a fine of twenty rupees is levied on one offender, or 2*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.*!

Two other cases of post-cremation of Brahmin's

widows, with no Police in attendance, are released without any punishment.

One Widow (or rather child) of nine years old, burnt. The Relations are said to have been sued, but no result is recorded.

Three cases are reported where no age is stated.

In an illegal case of non-age (eleven) the mother is said to have absconded, which, as elsewhere, appears to satisfy all complaint.

In two illegal cases of post-cremation by Brahmins' wives, and one, where an Infant was left unprovided for, the Offenders are said to have been "made over to the Court of Circuit," but no further result appears.

In a case of non-age (fifteen) no punishment was awarded; and, in another, of illegal post-cremation of a Brahmin's widow, two year's imprisonment followed.

One life only, appears to have been saved, through the interference of the Police, in addition to the 575 which have perished.

Although the regular Annual Returns go no lower than 1823, a case of gross irregularity is reported from the Bombay Presidency as late as October 1824, tending to shew the uselessness of the Prohibitory Rules as producing any real good.

The Parliamentary Returns have not been followed by any later Returns which have, as yet, been received at the East India House, but a Lieutenant of the 67th Regiment, known to myself, who has lately arrived from India, has furnished me with an ac-

count of two Suttees, which he witnessed at noonday, as recently as the month of June, 1826, taking place under circumstances of peculiar audacity, in the immediate front of the Government house, and College (only the river Hooghly running between) and which, from the atrocity of the circumstances, were as clearly Murder as any which preceded; and another most afflicting case occurring in the same month of June, 1826, is reported on unexceptionable testimony from Bangalore, (in the Mysore country, about sixty miles north of Seringapatam,) and has lately been brought before the British public in another shape, but having been already printed, I shall content myself with merely referring to it.*

The letter of the Lieutenant may here be read reporting the two Suttees, which he witnessed as late as June, 1826.

"The two other Suttees on which I would re-
"mark, took place at Calcutta, in the month of June
"1826; and, from the spot where the scene oc-
"curred, one would imagine it was chosen just
"out of triumph, as it was on the banks of the
"river Hooghly, just opposite the Palace of the
"Governor-General. I was paying a visit, at this
"time, to Principal Mill, at Bishop's College, who,
"with some other Clergymen, being anxious to

* It is contained in a Letter from Mr. England, dated 12th June, 1826, and was published by the Wesleyan Society in June 1827, by *Nichols*, Warwick-square. It will be found a document of the most interesting, and affecting description.

" prevent, by persuasion, so horrible a practice " taking place, and particularly so near a Christian " College, went to reason with the two poor " women, in order to dissuade them, if possible, " from their purpose, but without effect. They " then argued with the mercenary and merciless " Brahmins on the subject, but all their remon- " strances upon the cruelty and sinfulness of such " a procedure were in vain; for the Brahmins only " made this reply (which is their general one) and " completely stopped their mouths, viz. ' It is " our custom, and it is sanctioned by your laws— " if we are wrong in a moral point of view, your " laws are to blame for making this practice legal, " and thereby shewing that they approve of it as " just and right, and not cruel or sinful—so, if you " have any complaint to make, or any thing further " to say, don't trouble us, but go to your own " Magistrates and report to them.' This was " the substance of their answer to Mr. Mill, and " mentioned by him to me. And now, I will only " say, that this just method of reasoning of the " Brahmins speaks for itself, that, as long as this " dreadful practice is sanctioned by our laws, it " will assuredly continue, and, I fear, increase; " and the Brahmins will have perpetual cause to " exult, and throw the odium on our own laws for " permitting that which we ourselves consider to " be cruel, and in the sight of God, of a mur- " derous nature, and which they, the Brahmins, " know, in their consciences, to be evil, as they

" are often constrained to acknowledge, in close " argument. I have often heard this cruel prac- " tice spoken of by sensible men, long resident in " India, who universally agree, that if it were " made a capital offence by our laws, and a few " examples made by the Execution of offenders, " (even were they Brahmins, as they chiefly are,) " this evil custom would immediately cease to be " practised throughout all India: and which would " be only justly taking away the forfeited lives of " a few, to save the lives of thousands. I fully " agree in these opinions, though I cannot be so " competent a judge as the persons alluded to, who " have been so many years resident in India, and so " perfectly acquainted with the nature and character " of the Hindoos, of their Religion, and customs. As " to the increase or decrease of the Suttee since the " year 1823, (below which period it appears no offi- " cial Returns have been received at the India " House,) I am sure that the practice is not on the " decrease."

" I enclose you a printed statement of the two " Women to whom I have alluded, who were burnt " at Calcutta, in June last."

(Copy.)

" Another of those truly execrable Exhibitions, " called Suttees, took place at Calcutta, on the " 10th of June last, when two Women were burnt " with their deceased husbands. The sacrifice of " the poor deluded victims was so far voluntary " that they mounted the pile, only three or four

" feet high, and laid themselves down on the " corpses; billets of wood were then thrown upon " them; and our correspondent thinks that, from " the weight and number of these, they could not " have escaped, had they been desirous, on the " fire reaching them. The pile was lighted by " the eldest Son throwing a billet of burning wood " among its ready prepared combustibles. One of " the Women, who had a family, appeared to dis- " play the highest pleasure at the sacrifice, danc- " ing, and making the most joyous noise of any " one present. One or two of the female relations " of the victims, fainted on the pile being set fire " to."—*Calcutta Newspaper.*

I shall now add some cases in proof of the Indifference of the Local authorities to the waste of human life, and of the Insufficiency of punishment, which do not occur in the regular Annual Returns, but which are still to be found in the Parliamentary papers.

In 1817, the deplorable case already referred to, appears in the Parliamentary papers, occupying 20 pages, where a woman of 11 years and 8 months old, is burnt by the gross neglect of Mr. Sage, a Magistrate of the 24 Pergunnahs, who gave an Order for her burning, just before he was going to dinner, without ascertaining her age to be under the prescribed period, and this, under the knowledge, on his part, that the sacrifice of this woman had been actually prevented already by Mr. Eliot, the Magistrate in two different

districts, and who had advertised Mr. SAGE not to suffer it in *his* district; notwithstanding which, he issues the Order for her burning, on what he afterwards admits to be ignorance of the existing law, and insufficient information of the facts of the case, alledging the following reason, among others, for the Order he issued.

"The solicitude I felt lest the Woman should ex-
"pire, from the effect of her long abstinence, in-
"duced me to adopt this irregular mode of send-
"ing an Order that the Suttee might be performed," from which confession, it appears that he suffered a woman to be burnt, to prevent her being starved.

The Governor General in Council suffers this case to pass over with a reprimand put upon record.—Vol. 1. p. 45 to 65.

In the Reports of the Criminal Cases, adjudged by the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, in 1810, is the conviction of a Prisoner, for burying his Mother-in-law alive, who had the leprosy. He is "*cautioned by the Court against repeating the like conduct,*" that is, against burying his Mother-in-law alive again, for I cannot otherwise understand the caution.—Vol. 1. p. 25.

In another case, of the same period, the Prisoner had prepared a fiery pit for burning his Father-in-law, (who was leprous,) at his desire. The Judge of Circuit justifies the act as a Suicide of the Father, and quotes the case of the Hindoo Widows in point. —Vol. 1. p. 25.

In the Reports of cases adjudged in 1814, is a

case of a Son aiding a leprous Father to drown himself, the Son is declared *liable* to slight discretionary chastisement, while another person is held only deserving of admonition for concurrence, but the Court set them both at liberty *without* punishment, as holding them justified by the tenets of their creed. It seems that another man had burned his Father before, and as it was held he had a right to do so, this was supposed to be a case in point. —Vol. 2. p. 1.

Mr. PLOWDEN, of Barripore, by letter of 1st June 1822, addressed to Mr. HOPPER, a Magistrate, records a most illegal and frightful case which he had himself witnessed, the day before, in which the victim was so wrapped about with the corpse, that she could hardly have disentangled herself, and logs of wood were then laid upon her, some of such a size and weight as only one man could lift and carry; immediately after which, the pile was fired, and a large green bamboo was placed across, and held down by two men on each side, so as to render all escape impossible. The pile had scarcely been lighted, when she made a most violent effort to escape, but the nature and construction of the pile rendered every attempt unavailing, and she perished.

Mr. PLOWDEN further remarks on the grossly inactive and deficient conduct of the Darogah, who, instead of remaining in the immediate neighbourhood of the funeral pile, with a view of taking advantage of any relapse in the resolution of the vic-

tim at this awful moment, stood aloof from the spot, and when remonstrated with, replied that he being a Mussulman could not be permitted to remain so near, although in the face of this assertion, he saw European gentlemen surrounding the pile, but this was not all. The ceremony was suffered by him to take place, in known contravention of the principles and rules which authorize it.

All this abuse, be it remembered, was as late as the year 1822, the eighth year from the operation of the Regulations!

The Magistrate forwarded this letter to the Governor General in Council, and this is the answer, dated 13th of June 1822.

"His Lordship in Council, remarks that the "object of the transmission of Mr. PLOWDEN's "letter to Government is *not very apparent.*"

"In so far as the Officer's conduct is implicated "by the statement, you were yourself fully compe- "tent to pass orders on the subject. On the other "hand, the point of law involved in the 5th para- "graph," (viz. the fastening the victim to her dead husband, the heaping logs upon her, and holding her down by men with bamboos—"a point of law!") "would have been a fit subject for reference "to the Sudder Dewanny Adawlut, and Nizamut "Adawlut, in case you had doubts, whether the "mounting of the pile, in the manner stated, was "necessary to the legality of the Suttee."—Vol. 3. p. 4.

No more, of course, was heard of this case,—

for who would, or could, go on, after such a Letter from the highest authorities?

It is impossible to characterize this in any other manner than as a heartless letter. If any man can justify it, I will not say in England, but even in India, let him stand up, and do so. We see from it, that a good Samaritan would have helped the perishing! but that there are those in authority, who pass by on the other side.

Mr. Wright, the Magistrate of Furruckabad, on 15th of April, 1819, reports to the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, a grossly illegal burning of a Brahmin Woman, by post-cremation, where both parties were under age, and the marriage had never been consummated. This flagrant case is thus noticed by the Court in question. "Under all the circumstances, "and in consideration of the degree of influence "from superstition, and almost absence of free "agency, under which the parties who assisted, "appear to have acted, the Court have not con- "sidered it fit that further criminal cognizance of "their conduct, should be taken."—Vol. 1. p. 226.

In the Bombay documents, Vol. 3. p. 46., a case of gross illegality is reported in 1822, which, however, it was not deemed proper to visit with any punishment, the reason given for which, by the Governor in Council there (Mr. ELPHINSTONE,) to the Court of Directors at home, is as follows:—

"If there be any doubt that it would give of- "fence to interrupt the burning of a Suttee, there

" can be none that it would excite great disgust to " punish the deed when it was actually performed, " and it is not at all improbable that it would ex- " cite a spirit of discontent, if not of opposition. " We, therefore, consider it expedient that no fur- " ther notice should be taken of this transaction." —Vol. 3. p. 46.

Such, in fact, appears invariably to have been the policy which has guided the whole conduct of the Authorities and Courts of Bengal, through the entire nine years of the Returns. But what then becomes of the Prohibitory Regulations, and how has the legislative interference produced any good at all in restraining illegal Suttees, while it has sufficiently appeared, that infinite mischief has been produced by allowing those supposed to be legal ones?

The following Letter, printed in the Bombay Courier, of the 29th of September, 1823, and reprinted in the Parliamentary papers, Vol. 4. p. 165, is one of peculiar horror—Although it first appeared in a Public Newspaper, it is supported in all its parts by the distinct testimony of Captain Robertson, (the Collector and Magistrate of Poonah,) and by Major Taylor, Lieut. Morley, Lieut. Apthorp, Lieut. Cooke, Lieut. Swanson, Mr. George Lloyd, Mr. Pringle, (the second Assistant Magistrate,) and Mr. Arbuthnot, all of whom as eye-witnesses, give their evidence in this volume of the Parliamentary papers: indeed the Printed Evidence is far stronger as to the guilt of the Brahmins, than the Letter itself, only that the Letter is shorter.

" The unfortunate Brahminee of her own accord " had ascended the funeral pile of her husband's " bones," (which of itself renders the rite on her part positively illegal,) " but finding the torture of " the fire more than she could bear, by a violent " struggle, she threw herself from the flames, and " tottering to a short distance, fell down: some " Gentlemen, who were present,* immediately " plunged her into the river, which was close by, " and thereby saved her from being much burnt. " She retained her senses completely, and com- " plained of the badness of the pile, which she " said, consumed her so slowly, that she could not " bear it, but expressed her willingness again to " try it, if they would improve it: they would not " do so, and the poor creature shrunk with dread " from the flames, which were now burning most " intensely, and refused to go on. When the in- " human Relations saw this, they took her by the " head and heels, and threw her into the fire, and " held her there till they were driven away by the " heat—they also took up large blocks of wood " with which they struck her, in order to deprive " her of her senses, but she again made her es- " cape, and without any help, ran directly into the " river. The people of her house followed her " here, and tried to drown her, by pressing her " under the water, but a Gentleman, who was pre- " sent, rescued her from them, and she immediately

* They were chiefly Officers of the 10th regiment, as stated to me by Lieutenant W. of the 67th regiment.

" ran into his arms, and cried to him to save her.
" I arrived at the ground as they were bringing
" her this second time from the river, and I can-
" not describe to you the horror I felt, on seeing
" the mangled condition she was in: almost every
" inch of skin on her body had been burnt off; her
" legs and thighs, her arms and back, were com-
" pletely raw; her breasts were dreadfully torn;
" and the skin hanging from them in threads; the
" skin and nails of her fingers had peeled wholly
" off, and were hanging to the back of her hands.
" In fact, I never saw, and never read of, so en-
" tire a picture of misery as this poor woman dis-
" played. She seemed to dread being again taken
" to the fire, and called out to the " Ocha Sahib !"
" as she feelingly denominated them, to save her.
" Her friends seemed no longer inclined to force
" her; and one of her Relations, at our instigation,
" sat down beside her, and gave her some clothes,
" and told her they would not. We had her sent
" to the Hospital, where every medical assistance
" was immediately given her, but without hope
" of her recovery. She lingered in the most ex-
" cruciating pain for about twenty hours, and then
" died."

It may be proper to state, that the eye-witnesses, whose evidence is recorded, state, that three Brahmins were the parties who threw her into the fire, and that it was they, who at first attempted to drown her, after she had escaped from the fire, and before they threw her on the flames a second time.

They were her Relations, which greatly aggravates their crime. Mr. Arbuthnot says, she was quite willing to put herself in the hands of strangers, and appeared grateful for the kindness shewn to her.

In forwarding an account of this case, and the proofs respecting it, to Government, the Commissioner, Mr. Chaplin, very coolly says, "I am of "opinion, that for the sake of example, it will be "proper to bring the persons to trial who forcibly "threw the unfortunate woman on the pile after "she had escaped from it. They *probably acted* "*under mistaken notions of the propriety and* "*legality of this* brutal act, and ought not, per- "haps, on this account, to suffer *the full penalty* "*of so criminal a proceeding;* but whatever miti- "gation of it may be extended to them, the forms "of law in conducting their trial may have a good "effect in convincing the people that Government "will not tolerate the repetition of barbarities such "as *unfortunately* occurred on this occasion."

The "mere forms of law" so commended by Mr. Chaplin, it is apprehended, can only be useful as ending in adequate punishment upon conviction, but what was the result of this trial?

It will scarcely be believed, that in this most atrocious case, supported by the strongest and clearest testimony of the Magistrate and collector of the place (Capt. Robertson) and of several civil and military officers, who were present at the scene, that one of the Prisoners was acquitted at once, and the other two, released after a sort of judicial con-

demnation, (the phrase being—"found guilty to "a certain extent,") which was followed by no punishment whatever, because, on consulting the Pundits *after the trial and conviction,* whether the Shasters awarded punishment, either for preventing the escape of a victim from the fire, or for drowning her in water, they reported their opinions to be, that there was *no punishment* for such offences.

Most truly, indeed, does the learned Judge, on dismissing these Prisoners observe, that they were "indebted to the lenity of the Court, rather "than to the merits of the cause, in being sen- "tenced to no punishment." But what was Mr. ELPHINSTONE, the Governor of Bombay about, to permit these things to go on? See Vol. 4. p. 164 to 189.

To this head may be referred *the hardening tendency, and demoralizing influence of these Sacrifices.*

Three Judges write, from the Patna Court of Circuit, 11th January, 1819: "We have *the* "*pleasure* to transmit the Annual Report of the "number of Hindoo women who have burnt them- "selves on the funeral piles of their husbands, in "the year 1818."—Vol. 1. p. 217.

The Magistrate of Ghazeepore in a Letter to the Benares Court of Circuit in 1821, writes, "I "have *the pleasure* to forward the prescribed "Annual Report of Suttees."—Vol. 3. p. 28.

In another Return of Suttees, we are informed

of "a population of about *six lacs of souls.*"—Vol. 4. p. 155.

Even the respectable Archdeacon of Calcutta, says, "The scenes around me, grow horribly fami- "liar."—Vol. 4. p. 212.

I would ask, in concluding this head, have the Oriental Government done what they could, or indeed any thing, to enlighten the public mind, on the immoral and detestable nature of this sanguinary rite?

Might they not, at least, have tried persuasion and recommendation, especially with the more learned and influential of the Brahmins or Pundits?

It is painful to reflect that the Natives have done more for themselves, in discussing the subject, (as I shall afterwards shew) than the ruling power in India has done, or directed to be done for them, in attempting to convince them of the immorality and sin of the practice. Have not, then, the professions of the Local Government respecting their sense of this evil, been invalidated by conduct displaying the utmost indifference, and apathy? and is any ground established for reposing confidence in their disposition to put down so crying an evil in future?

The chronicles of blood now presented by the Official Returns, exhibit the Oriental authorities as more or less, preferring the ancient enquiry, "Am I my brother's keeper?" a question, founded, as of old, upon the Divine accusation—"Thy Brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground."

In 2384 cases of destruction out of 5425, occurring in the Bengal Presidency, no single observation, whatever, of the Magistrate occurs, so that for any thing that appears to the contrary, the grossest contravention of the Prohibitory Regulations may have taken place in all of them. The instances *actually returned* where no Officer, whatever, was present, are endless. The fines are generally merely nominal, and these are imposed without authority, for which infliction the Magistrates are frequently reprehended. The Security taken for the future good conduct of ascertained Murderers, is commonly as useless as that given for the maintenance of miserable Infants; and neither the one nor the other appear to be ever enforced. The Magistrates are, of course, above the law, and the Darogahs and other Officers, however they may act, are quite as safe as their Superiors, which cannot but be as well known to the Natives, as to themselves. In fact, the whole Returns of these nine years are filled with cases of gross recorded cruelty and illegality.

If a strong case of contradictory testimony should be necessary to shew the character and conduct of the Police and Relations examined after a burning, one occurs in Vol. 1. p. 215, where one witness declares, that after two ineffectual attempts, a Widow could not burn herself with fire which she applied to her hands—that when she came to the pile to be burnt, the flame miraculously burst forth of its own accord; while another afterwards admits that a Brahmin lighted it, who,

himself alledges that the Widow threatened him with ruin if he should not light it—a very likely statement! The whole case here recorded is one of gross irregularity, but the Brahmin is only required to give Security in twenty rupees, 2*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.* to appear, if *he should ever be required to do so*, of which, however, he need not have been very apprehensive, for almost immediately after, the Legal Court order that this Nominal bail shall be discharged.—Vol. 1. p. 217.

There is, perhaps, no stronger proof of the hopelessness of proceeding without a general law, than the whole conduct observed towards Capt. CARNAC, in 1816, who honestly desired to repress Infanticide, but was not allowed to do so, by the Governor of the Bombay Presidency.—See Parliamentary papers, Vol. 5. p. 96, et. seq.

I now come nearer home, and shall advert to the only recorded opinion of the Court of Directors upon this important subject, as it appears in their Letter of the 17th June, 1823, which is signed by Seventeen of their number, and is addressed to the Governor-General in Council.

"To us" (they observe) "it appears very "doubtful whether the measures which have been "already taken, have not tended rather to increase, "than to diminish, the frequency of the practice. "Such a tendency, at least, is not unnaturally "ascribed to a Regulation which, prohibiting a "practice only in certain cases, appears to sanc-"tion it in all others. And it is to be appre-"hended, that where the people have not pre-

"viously a very enthusiastic attachment to the "custom, a law which shall explain to them the "cases in which it ought not to be followed, may "be taken as a direction for adopting it in all "others.

"It is, moreover, with much reluctance that we "can consent to make the British Government, by "a specific permission of the Suttee, an ostensible "party to the Sacrifice: we are averse also to the "practice of making British Courts expounders "and vindicators of the Hindoo Religion, when it "leads to acts which, not less as Legislators than "as Christians, we abominate."*—Vol. 3. p. 45.

The Reply of Lord Amherst to this Letter, bearing date the 3d December, 1824, and signed "Amherst. Edward Paget. John Fendall," is of a most painful description; more especially as he had before him (which the Directors had not) the powerful reasoning of Mr. Harington, addressed

* The Hon. Chairman suggested, at this part of the Debate, the propriety of the *whole* Letter of the Directors being read to the Court, which was done accordingly; and I have therefore reprinted it in an Appendix. [No.1.] As I purposely abstained from all observations upon the character of that Letter during the discussion, I shall still leave it to the judgment of the Proprietors and the Public; with the single observation, that it was not until the 17th June, 1823, that this Letter was written; while the hideous Immolations to which it refers, had been proceeding from the commencement of British rule in the East; in addition to which, the Official Returns of the numbers annually burnt since 1805, and of the atrocious and illegal circumstances which attended so many of them, were before the Court when it was written.

to the Governor-General in Council, dated 28th June, 1813.—(See pp. 58 to 63.)

It opens by expressing the Governor-General's satisfaction at the Court of Directors "leaving to "the discretion of the Indian Government the "adoption or suspension of measures directed to "the abolition of the barbarous practice of Suttee," which I apprehend is rather expressive of what the Governor-General in Council deemed *fit* to be done by the Government at home, than any representation of what the Directors really *had* done.* The

* The Hon. Chairman here stated, that, in his opinion, this remark could not be supported; and in order to prove that the Directors had intended to leave such an unlimited discretion in Lord Amherst's hands as his Lordship had taken credit for, by his Answer; he read an Extract from their Letter to his Lordship. Upon this, I ventured to observe in my place, that the "large discretion" which the Directors, in that Extract, say they were "disposed to "give," did not amount to the sort of discretion which Lord Amherst supposed them to have given. Indeed, I apprehend that this must be clear to every one who compares the two Letters, unless he should hold, with Hudibras, that "a large discretion," like—

"A large *conscience*, is all one,
"And signifies the same as none."

It is evident, that if the view taken by the Hon. Chairman of the extensive discretion intended to be vested by the Directors in Lord Amherst be correct, the utmost it will prove is, that his Lordship is also correct in the construction which he has put upon their Letter. This, however, will still leave the question precisely where it was, as to the *propriety* of the Directors lodging such a discretion in the local Government, as late as the year 1823; while, on the other hand, if it should not appear from the

whole tenor of this Letter presents no hope, as late as December 1824, of any prospect of change, but rather the direct reverse; and this, after Ten years' experience of the Prohibitory Regulations. It is even expressly alledged by Lord Amherst, that the statements "do not promise the early cessa- "tion of the practice under the operation of exist- "ing causes;" and if any proof were needed that an impulse is essentially necessary on the part of the Parent Government, a reference to the entire Letter will supply it, beyond all possibility of doubt.—Vol. 4. p. 6.

It is impossible not to observe upon this Letter, that it entirely passes over the able reasoning of Mr. Harington, which, it is admitted, then lay before the Governor-General in Council, precisely as if it had never been urged. Indeed, there is little to excite our admiration at finding the destinies of a great Empire, and the blood of so many human beings, at the feet of a Triumvirate of Individuals who could have been content to dispose so summarily of such a question as this, with such Authorities before them.

It is further remarkable, that before this Reply of Lord Amherst and his Government of the 3d

Parliamentary Evidence that the Directors were by any means justified in reposing such an unlimited confidence in the Indian Government at that period, their Chairman has, by such a Declaration, subjected himself and his Colleagues to a responsibility, which I, as an Individual Proprietor, was unwilling to suppose they had contracted, and which I therefore abstained from imputing to them.

December, 1824, that same Government had transmitted to the Court of Directors, under date of the 23d July, 1824, the unprecedented and important information that Four Judges out of Five, of the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, had then recently decided for the total Abolition, after Ten years' experience of the Prohibitory Regulations; the substance of which information is, that the officiating Chief Judge having recommended the provision to be acted upon, (which had so long remained unsanctioned,) for ensuring timely notice being given to the Police, the three other Judges, and the officiating Judge, had dissented from him, (being four to one,) and declared *their* opinions to be, "that it would be preferable to enact a Regu- "lation for *the future prohibition of Suttees* "*throughout the country.*"—Vol. 4. p. 85.

These very important opinions are as under—

1. Mr. Courtney Smith, one of the Judges, says, "He has, on a former occasion, expressed "his opinion to Government, that the practice "ought to be abolished, and that it may be abo- "lished with perfect safety.

"He cannot, therefore, subscribe to any In- "structions that have a tendency to modify, sys- "tematize, or legalize the usage; or that appear "to regard a legal Suttee as at all better than "an illegal one.

"He is convinced, that if this mode of issuing "orders under the sanction of Government to re- "gulate Suttees is continued, the practice will

" take such deep root, under the authority of the " supreme power of the country, that to eradicate " it, will become impossible."

2. Mr. SHAKESPEAR, another Judge, says, " I " am decidedly against any Circular Order of the " nature proposed by the officiating Chief Judge.* " I conceive, that we have already done a great " deal of mischief in this way, and that instead of " diminishing, we have increased the evil.

" I am prepared to concur in a recommendation " to Government that a Regulation be promulgated, " prohibiting Suttees throughout the Country."

3. Mr. MARTIN, another Judge, says.—" To the " efficacy of such Regulations, the testimony of " experience has not I believe been favourable, and " my own opinion inclines me to impute to them a " positively pernicious tendency, in proportion to " the degree in which they have brought the Sacri- " fices under the more immediate cognizance of the " Officers of Government, whose presence at the " Ceremony, instead of operating as a restraint, " has, I am afraid, contributed to invest it with " additional solemnity, and to confer on the per- " formance of it, in the mistaken view of the " Natives, a species of authoritative sanction " which it was not before considered to possess."

" This toleration of the practice by our Govern- " ment, and its disposition to interfere no further

* Referring to Mr. Harington's proposal to punish, by law, the omission of previous notice to the Police, as first proposed in 1817, and now again recommended.

" than was necessary to guard it from abuse, has " been accordingly misconstrued into a tacit recog- " nition of the principle of an usage, the legality " of which, within certain specified limits, it has " formally acknowledged."

4. Mr. Ahmuty, another Judge, says:—" I feel " satisfied that it would be far preferable to enact " a Regulation prohibiting the practice of Suttees " at once, and rendering it punishable by law, than " having recourse to any partial, or indirect, means " to repress it gradually, if even such a result could " be reasonably expected to ensue."

To all this, is opposed the single opinion of the remaining Judge Mr. Harington on the 23rd July, 1824, which is in favour of delay, rather than immediate abolition at that moment, although nothing can be stronger than his advice for abolition in June, 1813, and which only appears to have been affected, but not altered, by the then state of politics arising out of the Burmese War—Vol. 4, pp. 147 to 150.

Mr. Harington himself also admits in this same Document of 23rd July, 1824, after the experience of above Ten Years of his own Prohibitory Regulations, that " the statements of the past year (1823) " *confirm what has appeared from every Report* " *for preceding years* that numerous instances have " occurred, of women being burnt without the know- " ledge of the Police Officers, and in many of them, " the act was illegal from circumstances which de- " prived it of the restricted sanction of the Shaster." —Vol. 4, p. 147.

To this, may be added that in the Bombay Presidency, at this same period of time, the Members of the Regulation Committee of the Judicial Department had stated by Letter of 21st June, 1824, that they were divided in opinion on the question whether the Immolation of Suttees should be prohibited or not, upon which difference of opinion, was it too much to expect that the wretched might have had the benefit of their doubts, as well as of the decision of the majority of four-fifths of the Bengal Judicature; the single Dissentient, Mr. HARINGTON, having felt no other difficulty than as to acting with promptitude at that particular moment, but none as to the necessity of the Abolition, the instant that India should be brought under more pacific relations?

The decision of the Governor General in Council in this Letter to the Court of Directors of the 3rd December, 1824 is the more remarkable, as in observing upon the several Returns of the preceding years he says :—

"This result does not furnish any sufficient "ground for concluding that the practice is ceasing "throughout the Country under the operation of "the existing Rules."

He yet however adds :—

"In the imperfect state of our information" [Ten years of trial, under the new Regulations, having then passed] "Government has anxiously avoided "legislating upon the subject." And further—"The papers now recorded, indeed, with the ex-"ception of Mr. HARINGTON'S Minute, contain

" little more than numerical Returns, and the bare " opinions of several highly respectable Public " Officers on the general question." [an overwhelming majority of which, it may be observed, are decidedly in favour of Abolition.]

" To shew, however," (his Lordship adds) " how " inconclusive such communications must be in sat- " isfying Government, ' it is sufficient to remark that " the point which appears to be of more importance " and delicacy than any other involved in the whole " question, viz. the probable effect of any prohib- " itory measures on the feeling of the Native Army, " has not hitherto been touched upon at all in any " of the opinions which have been submitted to " Government," the obvious answer to which appears to be :—

1. No evil effect had ever been anticipated by the several Judges, Magistrates, and Civil Officers of India (who could not possibly have overlooked the consideration) from such a source as the Native Army, and therefore they omitted to notice any.

2. If it be a sufficient reason against acting, that " a probable effect" injurious to the Empire, may be the result on the feelings of the Native Army—there can be no hope of its suppression being ever accomplished at all; because while the Native Army continue to be Hindoos or Mussulmen, it is impossible they should express any opinion *in favour* of the Abolition, nor indeed as an Army, become a deliberative body, to reason upon it at all.

His Lordship then concludes :—" He is unwilling " to abandon the hope that the abolition of the prac-

" tice, may *at a future period* be found safe and " expedient." And again:—

" While indulging in such a prospect, however, " he is of opinion that it would be unwise by any " formal act of legislation, * to encourage the im- " pression that Government is pledged to sanction " and recognize a barbarous rite which he anxiously " trusts will eventually *be suppressed*" although he considers from the then " state of external relations " and internal conditions, it would be inexpedient " to interfere further at that moment."—Vol. 4, p. 153.

Having now endeavoured to establish my First Proposition—that ENOUGH HAS NOT BEEN DONE FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THESE EVILS BY THE GOVERNMENT AT HOME OR ABROAD; I proceed to the proof of my Second, namely—that " MORE CAN NOW BE ACCOMPLISHED WITH PERFECT SECURITY TO OUR INDIAN EMPIRE."

And as an introduction to this part of my subject, I may perhaps be permitted to quote from the Parliamentary Papers, the following observation. " There is no instance on historical record, in which " acts of Humanity have ever excited public indig- " nation; Massacre, Confiscation, and Injustice " are the elements of Revolution—not Humanity, " Justice, and Equity—the mere supposition is an " anomaly in political science."—[Vol. 4, p. 26.]

And first, we have a Burning positively refused

* Referring to Mr. HARINGTON's proposal to punish by law the not giving previous notice to the Police, as first proposed in 1817, and now again recommended.

in 1789, without any injurious consequences having followed. The Collector of Shahabad writing to MARQUIS CORNWALLIS says:—

"The relations and friends of a Hindoo woman, "this day, applied for my sanction to the horrid "ceremony of burning with her deceased husband. "—*I positively refused my consent.*—The rites "and superstitions of the Hindoo Religion should "be allowed with the most unqualified tolerance, "but a practice at which human nature shudders, I "cannot permit without particular Instructions."—Vol. 1, p. 22.

In the reply to to this Letter, the Governor General approves the refusal; and concludes—"it is "hoped the Natives themselves will in the course "of time discern the fallacy of the principles which "have given rise to this practice, and that it will of "itself gradually fall into disuse."

Alas! it is now 38 years since this hope was expressed in vain.

The gratitude of a victim and her relations for a successful interference, will appear from a Letter of Mr. ELPHINSTONE, the acting Magistrate of Behar who, addressing the Government on 7th February, 1805, says of an intended victim of TWELVE years of age:—

"She appeared to be in a perfect state of stupe-"faction or intoxication, and as it did not appear to "be the wish of her friends that she should burn "herself," [he assigns no other reason!] "I deemed "it incumbent on me to exercise my authority, as a

" Magistrate, to prevent it, and I have since learnt " that the girl and her friends are extremely grate- " ful for my interposition." * [Vol. 1, p. 23.]

The Ease of prevention, without danger, will further appear from the following Authorities.

Extract of Letter from Mr. BAYLEY, Magistrate of Burdwan, dated 18th December, 1813.

" The Rajah and most of the principal people " were very urgent with me, to sanction her be- " coming a Suttee—I resisted the performance of " this abominable Sacrifice, and although numbers " of people were assembled, and the preparations " for the Sacrifice were all completed, I succeeded " in preventing it, without any hazard of popular " tumult or dissatisfaction."

He then records the prevention of four Burnings in his District, and adds that he " did not perceive " any general symptom of jealousy, tumult, or op- " position to the interference of the Police Officers " on those occasions."—[Vol 1, p. 37.]

Mr. BIRD the Magistrate of Benares reports in 1816, that Five Suttees had been prevented BY FORCE in two years, *without the slightest inconvenience.*—Vol 1, p. 95.

Extract of Letter addressed by Mr. BIRD, the Magistrate of Benares (the holy City) to Messrs. BROOK, SMITH, RUSSELL, and WYNNE, the four Judges of the Court of Circuit for that division,

* Note—This was the case which is recorded as having first produced the interference of Government to prevent irregular Sacrifices.

accompanying his Returns of Suttees for the year 1815, dated 23rd July, 1816.

After reporting a successful interposition of authority in forbidding an illegal Sacrifice, he adds "she was thereby saved from meditated self-destruction, without any exertion of authority beyond "that of simply informing her, that her application "to be permitted to become a Suttee could not be "complied with."

He then mentions another positive refusal in a similar case, and adds "my orders for that purpose "reached the Officers as GHOORNA (the intended "victim) was actually on the way in a Palanquin to "ascend the pile; and she was brought back to "her home, without any obstacle, by means of the "very conveyance in which she had quitted it. "This interference was not in the least objected "to, or considered as an infringement on established usage, either by the immediate family, or "by the people at large."

Mr. Bird then proposes a change of law, authorizing the proper authorities to prevent illegal Suttees by force; expressly alledging, that the mere statement required to be made by the Police of the illegality of the act, "unsupported by any "process of actual coercion, must necessarily, in "such a City as his, be attended with no effect."

This recommendation is from a Resident Magistrate of a City, which he says, is "full of religious enthusiasm," and who had yet himself prevented two Suttees from taking place there.—Vol. 1. p. 133.

In one case mentioned in the Parliamentary papers, a Sacrifice is prevented from the trifling circumstance of the woman being first required to burn her finger—an initiatory part of the ceremony which deterred her from proceeding.

Extract of a Letter from Mr. WATSON, Judge to the Court of Nizamut Adawlut. Dated Allypore, 16th April, 1816.

"The Letter from the Magistrate of Chin-
"surat deserves the serious attention of the Niza-
"mut Adawlut, and Government." [It is no where given in the Parliamentary papers.] "It appears
"that this abhorrent, and often utterly illegal prac-
"tice was forbidden by the foreign Governments
"of those Settlements, and that the prohibition
"was obeyed *without a murmur*. So little do
"the people appear to have interested themselves
"in the affair, that we find, from Mr. Forbes's
"Letter, that *the mere publication of an Order*
"*from himself, prohibiting the practice, effectually*
"*prevented it;* and that *no single instance* of a
"woman burning herself *has occurred since*. We
"really think there is as little justification for a
"woman to burn herself, as for a Rajkoomar to
"destroy his daughters at their birth, burying
"alive for the leprosy, where the party is desirous
"to die; human sacrifices at Saugor, putting sor-
"cerers to death, or killing a human creature by
"any other means, without justification or excuse;
"all of which are expressly made capital offences.
"By the Regulations, the killing in all these in-

" stances, (especially that contained in Sect. 3. of " Regulation of 1799, where the desire of the party " slain will not justify the killer,) has quite as " much in its favour on the score of erroneous pre- " judice and superstition, and perhaps of Religion, " as the practice of Suttee. But we do not find " that the punishment of death, denounced against " these crimes, has at all been considered by the " people as an infringement of that complete tole- " ration in matters of religion which it has been a " fundamental principle of the British Government " to allow. *And there can be no doubt that the* " *practice of Suttee might be as easily checked* " *and prevented, throughout the British terri-* " *tories, as any of the other murderous practices* " *above referred to.* We have the fact, that its " suppression at the foreign Settlements was ef- " fected without the slightest difficulty."—Vol. 1. p. 99.

I do not wish to disguise the fact, that the Court of Nizamut Adawlut afterwards (in June 1817) endeavour to overturn so much of Mr. Watson's reasoning as applies to the analogy of the cases cited by him, but as it appears to me, without success. Even they, however, attempt no answer to his remarks on the perfect practicability of abolition without inconvenience or danger. Nay, they expressly admit, [See Vol. 1. p. 107.], in concurrence with him, that " there is a strong presump- " tion that *little resistance would be opposed to* " *the suppression of a practice so repugnant to*

" *the common feelings of humanity*; if, from ex-
" perience of continued abuses in the investiga-
" tion or performance of female sacrifices, as now
" tolerated, it should at any time be deemed neces-
" sary to enact a Regulation for this purpose, pro-
" hibiting the Priesthood, and kindred of the de-
" ceased, as well as all others, from assisting in
" such Sacrifices." My object is to prove that such time has arrived.

In the Bengal Returns of 1817, the Magistrate of Burdwan says, the Woman (who had a young child) was persuaded by the Darogah *without difficulty* to relinquish the intention of burning.—Vol. 1. p. 150.

In Bombay, Mr. Hockley, in 1817, prevents a Suttee at Agassee, in the Island of Basseen, and is afterwards most gratefully thanked by the widow as her preserver. This was the first case since the Northern Concan was ceded to the Company; and as the Judge and Magistrate of Tanna writes, (under date 17th Oct. 1817,) " affords an example of the " success attending a judicious exercise of author-
" ity." Sir Evan Nepean (the Governor) proposed the thanks of the Government to Mr. Hockley; but Mr. Prendergast opposed such a Resolution, alledging that the indiscreet zeal of the Portuguese lost Basseen; to which the Governor modestly replies, that he did not presume to know as much about the matter as Mr. Prendergast, but that he had understood that one of the principal causes of the loss of Basseen was, not for interfering in the Religious

" ceremonies of the Natives, but by using compul-
" sory means to induce them to adopt the Chris-
" tian Religion."—Vol. 1. p. 245.

Mr. LAMBERT, the Magistrate of Shahabad, reports, with his Returns of 1823, as follows:—

" From the inquiries that I have been able to
" make, on the subject of Suttees, during the last
" two years, I do not hesitate to offer an opinion,
" that in this District" [one peculiarly addicted to the practice, and this single year, burning no fewer than thirty,] " it would not be attended
" with any dissatisfaction of a dangerous nature,
" if the Government should deem it proper to pro-
" hibit this lamentable custom altogether: it even
" appears to me, that the inhabitants of the Dis-
" trict, generally, are prepared to hear of such a
" prohibition."—Vol. 4. p. 122.

Mr. MELVILLE, the Magistrate of Ghazeepore, writes to the Judges of the Provincial Court of Circuit for the Division of Benares, under date of 3d December, 1824, as follows:—

" I am inclined to think, the people would be
" very well pleased to have so good a reason as an
" Order of Government would afford, for entirely
" giving up the performance of the Rite."—Vol. 4. p. 85.

With this view, agrees a Letter from a Correspondent of my own, who was many years a Civil Servant of the Company, and is now resident in this Country, who writes—

" It is very generally believed that Widows

" would be extremely well pleased if they were " enabled to say, when urged to ascend the funeral " pile by the Brahmins, ' I wish to give this proof " of devotion to my husband, but the British Go- " vernment have enacted Regulations which pre- " vent my doing so.'"

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Henry Pottinger, Collector of Ahmednuggur, dated the 10th of August, 1818.

After observing that the Wife of a Brahmin of high repute, had applied for leave to burn, and that although he had tacitly consented to the Sacrifice, he had refused to assist in defraying the expences of the requisite clothes for the woman, or for the wood to form the pyre, (so that it should seem these are *ordinary allowances* of the Agents of our Government,*) and had declined to sanction

* An Hon. Proprietor who afterwards opposed the Motion before the Court, (Mr. TRANT,) here signified his dissent from the conclusion thus deduced by me from the testimony of Mr. POTTINGER, and which is unfortunately but too well corroborated from other sources of equal respectability; but that Gentleman might have found, on turning to Vol. 3. p. 47. of the Parliamentary papers, that at one time, these detestable Sacrifices were actually encouraged on the part of the British Government, not merely by the contribution of clothes and wood, but by grants of free land, similar to the provision for the descendants of Sepoys killed in the service.

Perhaps I may here be permitted to express my deep regret, in common with many mutual friends, that Mr. TRANT should have appeared in opposition to this Motion. It was observed, at the period when it became a question of extending to our Indian Empire, the advantages of our own Ecclesiastical Establishment — that the persons who displayed the least information, and the

the proceeding by his presence, or that of any person on his part, he adds, "from what I have "heard from several *very respectable Brahmins*, "I am almost satisfied that the exercise of a very "trifling degree of authority would put a stop to "this perversion of reason and humanity in future: "indeed I anticipate a very good effect towards "checking it, from the undisguised manner in which "I have expressed the abhorrence and disappro- "bation of the British Government, on this occa- "sion, and I trust you will approve of what I have "done. It appears that the late Peishwa fre- "quently, personally, exerted himself to dissuade "women from becoming Suttees, and that he al- "ways took upon himself the charge of supporting "those who attended to his advice."—Vol. 1. p. 65.

The Magistrate of Ghazeepore, in transmitting his Returns for 1821, to the Benares Court of Circuit, observes:—

"For a few years more, (I cannot say how "many,) we must be contented to permit a con- "tinuance of the practice."

Let it be observed that we have waited Six!

most prejudice, on the subject, were not Hindoos or Mahomedans, but the Anglo-Indians of that time. The wisdom and good sense, however, of the British Parliament, and of the British Public, found no difficulty, on that occasion, in adopting a sound and righteous conclusion upon that deeply interesting question, in spite of the alarms which were professed to be felt, and of the prognostications which were so liberally uttered by Gentlemen, who, to use the language of Mr. BURKE, "appeared to have been "unbaptized in their outward bound passage to India."

"The next step perhaps would be to get another "Bewastah condemning the practice in toto, and "a concurring resolution from a number of Brah- "mins, in various parts of the country, to abandon "it. I shall not conceive either of these measures "at all impracticable, if attempted gradually and "cautiously."—Vol. 3. p. 29.

Certainly it cannot be at all impracticable, from what we have seen, to obtain any Opinion from the Pundits, of whatever kind.

At Fort Saint George, on the 6th of March, 1823, Mr. ORMESBY, Superintendant of Police, reports a case of positive interdiction by his authority, of the regular Suttee of a Brahmin's widow, in which no inconvenience followed.—Vol. 3. p. 51.

Mr. EWER, the Acting Superintendant of Police, in the Lower Provinces, in his most able Appeal to the Governor General in Council, dated Calcutta, 18th of November, 1818, says,

"My opinion is, that the barbarous custom of "Suttee may be prohibited without exciting any "serious, or general, dissatisfaction among our "Hindoo subjects."—Vol. 1. p. 229.

Mr. PECHELL, Magistrate of Chittagong, in a Letter, dated 15th of December, 1818, says,

"I do not think that much, if any, difficulty "would be experienced in abolishing the practice, "if a law for that purpose were to be established." —Vol. 1. p. 233.

Mr. MOLONY, Magistrate of Burdwan, in a Letter, dated 14th of December, 1818, says,

"After having attended at several Suttees myself, for the purpose of gaining as much information as possible on the subject; and having paid considerable attention to it, ever since I have been in this District; and after having attentively considered the doctrines under which it is sanctioned, the circumstances attending the actual performance of the Sacrifice, and the terms upon which those who have been prevented from burning, have subsequently lived with their Relations and Neighbours—I am decidedly of opinion that the Abolition of the practice by law, would not be attended with any evil consequences; on the contrary, I think the enactment of such a law is dictated by every principle of humanity; nor does it appear to me that the Abolition of the practice is altogether inconsistent with the spirit of Toleration, which has ever distinguished the British Government."—Vol. 1. p. 235.

And then follow his arguments, which appear unanswerable, but are too long to quote, after which, he adds,

"I am persuaded that 99 out of 100 women sacrifice themselves more under the influence of the infatuation poured into their ears, by ignorant Brahmins, than from any conviction of their own minds." And again:—"I do not think any evil effects are to be dreaded from the enactment of a law abolishing this Sacrifice."

Mr. Oakeley, the Magistrate of the Zillah of Hooghley, by a letter addressed to the Superinten-

dant of Police, at Calcutta, dated 19th of December, 1818, says,

"I do not hesitate in offering my opinion, that "a Law for the Abolition of Suttees would only be "objected to, by the heirs who derive worldly pro- "fit from the custom; by Brahmins who partly "exist by it; and by those whose depraved nature "leads them to look on so horrid a Sacrifice, as a "highly agreeable and entertaining show; at any "rate, the sanction of Government should be with- "drawn without delay."—Vol. 1. p. 237.

Of the four Judges of the Supreme Court of Nizamut Adawlut, in May, 1821,—one, (Mr. Courtney Smith,) is decidedly opposed to the continuance of the practice. The chief Judge, (Mr. Leycester,) thinks that a decision of the Natives' own Hindoo law against it, would not be unattainable,—indeed, there is little doubt that the Pundits would give one opinion, quite as easily as another—and he further thinks, that the intention of the Government to discourage the practice, is not, under the present system, *sufficiently perceptible*. A third Judge, (Mr. Goad,) was for its continuance, as he appears to have been from the beginning, as was a fourth, but even he admits that one half of the Magistrates in 1820, were for its Abolition, and the other half against it. If their opinions were thus divided, I ask, why is the balance to be struck against God and nature?

Mr. Courtney Smith, one of these Judges, says,

" My opinion is, that the Toleration of the prac-
" tice is a reproach to our Government, and that
" the entire and immediate Abolition of it, would
" be attended with no sort of danger."

" A preamble to the following effect, would not
" perhaps be unapt.

" Whereas the practice of Suttee is shocking
" to humanity and contrary to nature, and whereas
" the British Government, after the most careful
" inquiry, and the most mature consideration, feels
" it impossible to be satisfied that this commission
" of self-murder can ever be in truth the free, vo-
" luntary, unbiassed, and uninfluenced, act of the Fe-
" male who is sacrificed, and whereas to interfere
" with a vigorous hand for the protection of the
" weak against the strong, of the simple against
" the artful classes of its subjects, is one of the
" most binding, imperious, and paramount duties of
" every civilized state, a duty from which it cannot
" shrink, without a manifest diminution of its dig-
" nity, and an essential degradation of its charac-
" ter among nations.—Therefore," &c. &c.

Mr. DORIN, one of these Judges, says,

" Between absolute suppression of the practice,
" and the toleration which now prevails, I do not
" see any medium."—Vol. 2. p. 63.

In the Returns of the year 1818, the Magistrate of Ghazeepore, reports that a Brahmin's wife, five months after his death, prepared to be burnt; but the Officer restrained her, and made a report to

the Magistrate: an Order was issued on no account to permit her to burn, and she consented to forego her purpose.—Vol. 1. p. 209.

Mr. C. M. LUSHINGTON, the Magistrate of Trichinopoly, [Madras] addressing the Southern Provincial Court of Circuit, there, under date of 1st Oct. 1819, writes, "when I was acting Magistrate at "Combaconum" [which is "the ancient capital of "the kingdom," Vol. 2. p. 110.] "I addressed the "Government on this subject, and pledged myself "to put a stop to all future instances of self immo- "lation, without any ill consequences arising from "the prevention. I look upon this inhuman prac- "tice as one tolerated to the disgrace of the British "government: it is even abominated by the better "sort of Natives themselves, and no where is it "enjoined by Hindoo law."

And then, after mentioning the authority of Menu, "revered by the Hindoos as the first and greatest "law authority," as clearly against the practice, because he has prescribed a line of conduct to be observed by Widows after the death of their husbands, he adds,

"The only possible plea, or excuse, therefore, "for the continuation of a practice so abhorrent "to humanity, and irreconcilable with reason, is the "fear of exciting an apprehension of interference "on the part of the British Government, in the "Religious usages and customs of the country."

After adverting to the Suppression of Infanticide, and of the native punishment of Sorceries, by death; and also to the Execution of Brahmins; he says,

"Convinced that no bad consequences could "possibly result from the Abolition of Suttees, "I submit the propriety of making, by legal enact- "ment, the Attendants of such assemblies accom- "plices in the Murder."—Vol. 2. p. 104.

Mr. GOWAN, the Criminal Judge of Verdachellum, writes to the Southern Provincial Court of Circuit, Trichinopoly, under date of 9th July, 1819, that Mr. CUNLIFFE, the commercial resident at Verdachellum, had refused to permit a Sacrifice, and that the woman had abandoned the design and was then living.—Vol. 2. p. 113.

Mr. HYDE, the Magistrate of Cuddalore, informs the same Court by date 2d August, 1819, that the *mere threat of a* fine had prevented a burning.—Vol. 2. p. 115.

Mr. BIRD, the Criminal Judge of Trichinopoly, under date 26th of August, 1819, informs the Southern Provincial Court, Trichinopoly, that Mr. AUFRERE, and Mr. GREGORY, Judges and Magistrates, had refused permission to a Brahmin's widow, with perfect success.—Vol. 2. p. 116.

Mr. HAIG, the acting Criminal Judge of Tinnevelly, under date of 29th Dec. 1819, addressing the Southern Provincial Court of Circuit, Trichinopoly, transmits five authenticated documents to prove, as he says, "the successful interposition of the "Magistrate's authority on a late occasion, in pre- "venting the immolation of *two* females of high "rank."—Vol. 2. p. 122.

Extract of a letter from Mr. WRIGHT, the

Magistrate of Furruckabad to the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, dated 15th April, 1819.

"I beg to observe that it might be attended "with good effects if some punishment were "awarded; and operate as a check to the growth "of this barbarous custom, which, though it was "at one time *wholly unknown in these provinces,* "*appears,* under the British Government, to be "gaining ground once more.

"If the British, *in imitation of the Mogul* "*Government,* were to lay an immediate and posi- "tive inhibition upon it, and would declare the "parties aiding in the ceremony, indictable for "Murder, and proceed against them accordingly, "it must totally die away; but if *tolerated, under* "*whatever restrictions, I do not hesitate to pro-* "*nounce, that it will, in a short term of years,* "*become nearly as prevalent as it is now in* "*Bengal.*"—Vol. 1. p. 212.

Mr. WARNER, the Magistrate of the Twenty-four Pergunnahs, writes, by letter of Dec. 1818, to the acting Superintendant of Police in the Lower Provinces.

"A law might doubtless be promulgated for the "Abolition of the practice, without causing any "serious disturbance." And he quotes Lord Wellesley's successful interference at Saugor, &c. —Vol. 1. p. 239.

Mr. CHAPMAN, the Magistrate of the Zillah Jessore, by Letter of 23d Dec. 1818, says,

"Any law abolishing the Suttee would be at-

" tended with no other effect than it should have " under every good system of government,—the " immediate and due observance of its enactments. " —I would most willingly undertake to promulgate " any Orders regarding its Abolition, throughout " the District under my charge, without dread of " any ill consequences arising from the interference " of Government."—Vol. 1. p. 241.

Mr. FORBES, the first Judge of the Calcutta Court of Circuit, by Letter to the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, dated 5th August, 1819, says,

" I express my concurrence in the opinion which " I found to prevail with the judicial Officers at " the several stations with whom I conversed on " the subject, that the practice, if prohibited by " Government, might be effectually suppressed, " without apprehension of any serious obstacles."—Vol. 1. p. 243.

Mr. HALE, the Judge of the Southern Concan [Bombay] under date of 4th Oct. 1819, writes, that, in that portion of the Empire, he found the practice " had entirely ceased on the institution of " the Company's Government, apparently caused " by a very general opinion which prevailed among " the Natives, though without reason, that the " Sacrifice was totally repugnant to the laws, as " well as to the feelings, of Government; in short, " that it would not be permitted."—Vol. 1. p. 259.

Can there be a stronger fact to prove the ease with which the practice might be abolished than the declaration, that the mere notion that it was not to

go on, without a single Order against it, actually stopped it, through a whole territory?

He then mentions the case of a young Officer having prohibited the Suttee, though contrary to any right he had to do so, which, however, was fully acquiesced in, and the Widow was then living and thankful for her escape.

He adds, also, that in the Peishwa's Territories, and in the neighbouring State of Sawunt Warree, a positive prohibition against the practice created no disturbance, and no outward marks of discontent "affording" (says he) "a most favorable instance of what might be done, and what the "people would submit to, without considering "their Religious prejudices too much shocked."—Vol. 1. p. 259.

It is melancholy to add, as noticed before, that notwithstanding this able reasoning, the Prohibitory Regulations were adopted in the Presidency of Bombay, under the precedent of Bengal; and the Suttees which followed in the Southern Concan in 1820, were 66—in 1821, 50—in 1822, 47—and in 1823, 38.

Mr. WARDEN, the Member of Council for Bombay, records the following opinion:—"Whilst I am "fully aware of the delicacy of this important "question, I am at the same time equally con-"vinced of the practicability of abolishing, not "only this, but also every other sanguinary prac-"tice of the Hindoos, and without endangering

" either the popularity, or the security of our " Supremacy."—Vol. 1. p. 261.

Extract of a Letter from Mr. C. M. Lushington, Magistrate of Combeconum [Fort St. George.] Dated 14th Sept. 1813.

" I feel emboldened in the cause of humanity, " to state that the practice is neither prescribed " by the Shaster, nor encouraged by persons of " education or influence.

" I can speak from positive authority, that the " *Rajah of Tanjore* has ever discouraged it; " and I feel assured, that with the exception of a " few necessitous Brahmins, who derive a nefa- " rious reward for presiding at this infernal Rite, " the Prohibition of the practice would give uni- " versal satisfaction."—Vol. 1. p. 270.

What will be thought, after this declaration that the Rajah of Tanjore, a native Prince professing Idolatry, had ever discouraged this practice; that in consequence of the adoption of the Prohibitory Regulations, no fewer than Seventeen Sacrifices took place, under our Government, in 1820, and Seven, up to the month of June in 1821?—See Parliamentary paper, No. 6, ordered to be printed 1st July, 1825.

It appears, from an Extract from the Proceedings of the Criminal Court of Fort St. George, dated 18th December, 1820, that the Criminal Judge of Masulipatam declares his opinion to be, that " the practice might be altogether abolished

" by an ordinance of Government, without offence " to the religious feelings or prejudices of the " Natives."

The Magistrate of Bellary states, that " on two " occasions, when parties have applied for permis- " sion, the Sacrifice has been prevented;" and a Magistrate at Cuddapah says, that four were prevented " by the authority of the Magistrate." In another case, he says, " Three different appli- " cations were made to me for permission to allow " a woman to burn herself, which I peremptorily " refused; and told the people, that if it were at- " tempted to perform the ceremony, I would stop " it *by force*."—Vol. 2. p. 90.

The Magistrate of Trichinopoly proposes " a " legislative enactment for the purpose of abolish- " ing the practice."

The Criminal Judge of Verdachellum states the successful refusal of the acting Commercial Resident at Cuddalore, to give his consent to the Sacrifice; and the Magistrate of the same place states, that no one has happened since the transfer of that Territory,—the Police informing all parties that they will be fined severely.

At Madura, the Police prevented the act on previous request for its permission.

The Criminal Judge of Masulipatam writes, 27th July, 1819, in proof of the Ease of Abolition, " Application was once made to the Criminal Judge, " when a Magistrate, by the Relations of a Widow, " for his permission to burn herself. He informed

"them, that the British Government made it a "rule never to interfere with the Religious preju- "dices or customs of the natives, and that there- "fore he would not give any Order whatever to "the Woman herself, who might act as she chose; "but he assured them that he would immediately "commit, as accomplices in the Murder, all per- "sons who should in any way assist her to destroy "herself; and the consequence was, that the "Woman did not burn, but is alive, and well, at "this day. This measure did not cause the least "dissatisfaction; on the contrary, her Relations "appeared pleased at her having obtained a de- "cent pretext for avoiding the horrid ceremony." —Vol. 2. p. 85.

The Magistrate of Guntoor (Mr. Oakes) writes, under date 25th Oct. 1819: "It twice came to the "knowledge of the Magistrate that the ceremony "was about to be performed, when he immedi- "ately sent two or three respectable Natives to "dissuade the woman, and to stop the ceremony. "On these occasions, *the women were easily re-* "*conciled to live,*" as there is quite as little doubt they would be on any similar occasion.—Vol. 2. p. 87.

The Magistrate of Nellore writes to the Provincial Court, under date 11th Sept. 1819:

"The persons intending to burn, have gene- "rally intimated their determination to the Heads "of the Police, and gone through the ceremony "of asking him to procure the permission of the

" principal authority in the District, but without " any intention of complying with directions against " the Immolation, in case such were sent; and to " prevent any discussion upon the subject, the " catastrophe has usually taken place before an " answer could have been received from the Police " Station."—Vol. 2. p. 88.

And to the same effect is the statement of Mr. ROBERTS, the Magistrate of Chittoor, dated 12th August, 1819, who says, " I do not believe that " a Sacrifice ever takes place without the cogni- " zance of the Police, who endeavour to dissuade " the parties; and, if unsuccessful, direct them to " wait the decision of the Magistrate, to whom the " circumstance is immediately reported. But their " injunctions have never been attended to, and the " Rite is concluded, long ere the Magistrate's " Order can reach the spot."—Vol. 2. p. 93.

Mr. HIGGINSON, the Criminal Judge of Trichinopoly, says, in his official Report to the Provincial Court of Appeal and Circuit, dated 16th February, 1820, " If I were required to give my opinion " as to the best means of putting a stop to " the practice, I should say, that the Collector and " Magistrate ought to be authorized to issue a " Proclamation, prohibiting altogether a custom so " barbarous and unnatural, and which, though " *permitted*, does not by any means appear to be " *insisted on* by the Shasters. I would authorize " the Magistrate to declare by the Proclamation " any person assisting in the Self-immolation of a

"Widow, liable to be brought to trial as an acces-
"sary in homicide; and would issue strict orders
"to all heads of villages and officers of Police, to
"put an immediate stop to any attempt at prepar-
"ation for the Rite.

"In the present times, the good sense and
"humane feeling of the greater proportion of the
"Hindoo Inhabitants would point out the benevo-
"lent motive of Government in prohibiting a prac-
"tice, which has originated in ignorance and infa-
"tuation, and which must be reflected upon with
"abhorrence by every mind capable of distin-
"guishing good from evil."—Vol. 2. p. 101.

Mr. PELLEY, Magistrate of the Southern Concan [Bombay], says (May 11, 1820), "If the "humane intentions of the Supreme Government "have been so far answered as to have produced "the effect of saving many Widows from a cruel "death, it can, on the other hand, hardly be "doubted but that the work has given the cere-"mony in the eyes of the natives a stamp of legal-"ity which, in our provinces, it never before pos-"sessed. And it may therefore be questioned, "whether, upon the whole, more harm than good "may not have followed its publication. I have "already recorded it as my opinion, that if it were "thought desirable to suppress the practice *by* "*coercion*, it might safely and effectually be ac-"complished in the Southern Concan."—Vol. 4. p. 156.

Colonel ROBERTSON, Collector and Magistrate

of Poonah [Bombay], addressing the Commissioner in the Deckan, by a Report, dated 9th Oct. 1823, (the last year of the Official Returns from India,) says, "The feeling, I may almost say, is "general, to stop the Suttees; and it was hinted "to me, through various respectable channels, "that although a shew of discontent would be ex- "hibited, an Order of Government to prevent their "continuance would be a palatable measure."—Vol. 4. p. 167.

This opinion is the more valuable from this Gentleman, inasmuch as from his own statement in the Parliamentary papers, he had taken great pains by a public conference with the Brahmins, to convince them of the impropriety of the practice, but as might have been expected, entirely in vain; and had also at one time humanely imagined that by always securing the construction of the Pile, in a particular manner which he had persuaded himself was in conformity with the Shasters, he should render some advantage to the cause of humanity—a result which was at best very doubtful; but in which attempt, he met with no support, either from the Brahmins, or from the Constituted Authorities. He here seems to have renounced these temporizing expedients of a mistaken policy, and to have brought himself to acquiesce in the better opinion, that all such palliatives were entirely hopeless.

In the Fourth Volume of the Parliamentary Papers, we have an account of Two Englishmen,

in October, 1823, ordering all the Brahmins who were in pursuit of a wretched victim who had fled from the burning pile, to stand back; and they obey them at once, without reserve, although with a crowd of their own people at their heels.—Vol. 4. p. 173.

And in the same Volume, in an account of a Suttee at Severndroog, inclosed in a Letter from the Secretary of the Bombay Government to the Magistrate in the Southern Concan, dated 20th Oct. 1824, the writer says, "The Brahmins "seemed impatient of the delay which my remon- "strances had occasioned, and at first attempted "to answer for the woman; but upon my reject- "ing their interference, they gave me no further "interruption."—Vol. 4. p. 212.

The following Extract of a Letter, which has already appeared in print, written by Mr. Julius, and dated Richmond, the 25th February, 1820, represents the Brahmins and a whole mob flying before two English Ladies, who were thus enabled to rescue a victim from the flames.

"During our residence at Arrah, in 1804, "Mrs. Julius was informed, that in a field near "our own grounds, a multitude of people were con- "ducting a Widow to a Funeral Pile. As the pro- "cession drew near, great shoutings, and the con- "fused noise of various instruments, were heard. "At this moment Mrs. Trower, the Collector's "Lady, called at our house in her carriage. Equally

" shocked with Mrs. J. at this account, they both
" agreed to attempt the delivery of this wretched
" Female. With this hope, they directed the
" Coachman to drive them to the spot. As the
" carriage approached, the mob took to flight, so
" that they drove up to the Pile without difficulty,
" which they found was in flames! In an agony
" of mind they walked round it, and perceived
" that the roof had not fallen on the body of the
" deceased, but was resting on the edge of the
" Pile: that the place prepared for the Widow, at
" its head, was unoccupied; and that the poor
" creature had availed herself of the opportunity
" afforded her by the confusion to effect her escape.
" Accompanied by their attendants, Mrs. J. and
" Mrs. T walked into the village. One of the
" Hirkarrahs, who knew the woman, pointed out
" her hut, which was close shut up. The Ladies
" requested admittance. No answer was given.
" They then threatened to have the door broken
" open: upon which a door, leading into the com-
" pound, was opened; and here they beheld a tall
" female, apparently about twenty-six years of age,
" standing, surrounded by four children, and a
" baby in her arms. Her eldest son, about twelve
" years old, at some distance, was crying. Her
" hair was very long, hanging down, and oil and
" ghee were dropping from it to the ground. Her
" head was covered with sandal dust, and her
" whole body was highly perfumed. Without the
" least reluctance she consented to accompany the

" Ladies to my house with all her children. On her " arrival I discovered that one of her shoulders was " very much burnt. On being questioned, she de- " clared that her intended immolation was not a " voluntary act, but the consequence of terror, from " the threats of the Brahmins, who had also given " her large quantities of Opium and Bang, and that " for many hours previous to her arriving at the " Pile, she was in a state of distraction and stupe- " faction. It appears that the Brahmins, seeing " the carriage drive near, hastily threw down the " roof, intending it to fall on the pile, and prevent " the escape of the victim; but providentially they " failed: it rested on its edge, and allowed her an " opportunity to fly. This poor woman remained " some time with Mrs. T. and then returned to her own village."—Remarks on Immolations in India, by BLACK & PARRY in 1820.

One of the Company's Madras Civil Officers, now in England, writes as under, on the Ease of Abolition by the present Supreme and Civil Authorities, without disturbance:—

" The practice of Suttees came officially under my " notice in India, and as to the practicability of its " suppression—from my own experience and know- " ledge of the Native character, I should say deci- " dedly that a specific denunciation against all " abettors of this practice by the Government, " would be sufficient to secure it—and this I am of " opinion could not only be done with safety, but " without a murmur from the Native Population.

" The difficulty I am aware—is how to evidence the " practicability to the Proprietors, and the Court. " I refer first to LORD WELLESLY's denouncing the " Sacrifice of children at Saugur which was a Re- " ligious act, done in performance of a vow to the " Deity: to interfere with it, was therefore to inter- " fere with the Religious feelings of the people—it " has now been in force above twenty years, and I " challenge any one to adduce an instance of resist- " ance to it. Here is a trial of sufficient duration to " afford the necessary proof, that acts of the " Government which may have for their end the " suppression of barbarous and inhuman rites, will " meet with no opposition from the Natives.

" Some of the functionaries in the Madras Pro- " vinces reported that they had prohibited in effect " the practice in their Districts, and some cases came " under my own cognisance. One Magistrate of " my acquaintance put a stop to it in his District by " requiring from the Police, notice of the intended " performance, and directed that without his " permission it should not be proceeded in: this " permission he stated could not be granted till " after communication with the superior authorities " for Instructions, as it was not matter provided for " by the Regulations. This occasioned a delay, " and the parties invariably found it more conveni- " ent to burn the body of the deceased, without " sacrificing the Widow, than to retain the body " in a putrid state; and themselves subject to " much personal inconvenience from the religious

" impurity contracted by the delay. This measure " checked, if it did not wholly suppress, the prac- " tice in one large District for some years. In " another case I have known the practice greatly " checked, simply by the European Officer making it " specifically known to his Native Officers that it " was his wish that such Sacrifices should not take " place, and calling upon them to use the influence " of their stations to prevent them. In one or two " instances I have seen the practice suppressed, by " the Magistrate assuming, on his own responsibi- " lity, the power to refuse to permit any burnings in " his District—and in no case, have I ever heard of " its producing the slightest disturbance."

Upon the above suggestions, however, it must be observed, that however they may prove the perfect practicability of suppression *when attempted,* the whole Evidence supplied by the Parliamentary Volume, No. 5, " on Infanticide," is altogether opposed to any dependence being placed on the exercise of a discretionary and undefined power by the local agents, with any reasonable hope of a general concert among them, or any prospect of permanent advantage, or final abolition.

A Chaplain of the Company long resident in India writes to me, as to the ease of interference, as under, dated February 23rd, 1827:—

" Of the practicability of the abolition of these " Sacrifices of poor Widows with the most perfect " safety, without the interruption of the peace of the " Country for a moment—and even with the thanks

" of multitudes, I have not the least doubt. *It is* " a great mistake to say that this is one of the very " deep rooted, general customs of the Country, " which, on that account, it would be dangerous to " meddle with. It has been voluntarily discon- " tinued over a very large part of India, and is " scarcely ever practised in the Peninsula from " much above Madras to Cape Comorin. I am " doubtful whether a single instance occurred " nearer to us at Madras than Chittoor, the whole " time that I was in South India, from the very " beginning of 1807."

The late Mr. WARD in his Printed Letter to the present EARL of CLARENDON, (already referred to,) says, " I cannot refrain from giving it as my decided " opinion that this dreadful practice might easily be " abridged, and finally abolished by the British " Government, without creating any alarm among " the Hindoos."

Another Resident in India for a considerable period, now in Edinburgh, writes as follows:—

" I rejoice to observe that any step is taken " towards removing this load of guilt from the " British name in India—on the heinous nature of " this practice, and the ease with which it might be " stopped, there can be little reasonable doubt. " The dreadful practice prevails more in the neigh- " bourhood of Calcutta than any where; were it " to be accounted Murder, however, for any one to " assist the unhappy Widow in putting an end to " her life, and parties were to be committed to take

" their trial accordingly, it would gradually extin-
" guish the zeal of any Native for these dreadful
" practices."

The same Individual had, before, addressed a Letter from India, to the same effect, as follows:—

" It is only for the British Government to say,
" the Murder of your Widows is contrary to reason,
" and revolting to humanity—WE FORBID IT, and
" the practice will cease, without giving birth to the
" slightest tumult or dissatisfaction. The Widow
" will continue quietly at home engaged in the nur-
" ture of her offspring; but should the relations
" from any motive tempt her to the banks of the
" River, and endeavour to fasten her to the funeral
" Pile, our Officers will interfere for her rescue,
" and the surrounding multitude in imitation of
" their fore-fathers on an occasion of far higher
" interest, *will betake themselves to flight*, and
" forty years after the prohibition, our Indian Em-
" pire will be found, as far as this interference could
" effect it, equally unimpaired in its vigour, and
" more deeply fixed in the enlightened attachment
" of its subjects."

The following is an Extract of a Letter from one of the Company's Chaplains, who has passed a considerable part of his life in Bengal, dated 21st February, 1827:—

" As to the *practicability* of abolishing the cus-
" tom, there is, I believe, but one opinion with well
" informed persons.—Nothing would be easier.—
" The Government has only to frame a regulation

" prohibiting the practice under proper penalties—
" the highest penalties—and the local Magistrate
" would then be empowered to act with decision.
" I do not apprehend the smallest political risk
" would be incurred by such a prohibition, and
" this I know to be the opinion of some of the
" ablest and most experienced Magistrates in Ben-
" gal. The Natives would submit *as a matter of*
" *course.* An immense majority would approve.
" Some of the determined and violent adherents to
" custom, might do the deed in private; but this
" could not often occur. The practice would gra-
" dually die away, and we shall have wiped off the
" stain which now attaches to our Government.

" The question, as it respects political risk, is
" not to be gravely discussed.—Another question
" may arise in the minds of those who consider the
" character of our Government in India, as to
" whether it is fair and equitable to do that which
" interferes with their Religious system. But this
" question may be soon settled. No theories of
" what may be politically expedient, ought to
" sanction what is a flagrant breach of every natu-
" ral and moral feeling. The voice of reason and
" humanity ought to prevail.

" I could have wished the odious practice were
" abolished by the Government *there*; but as this
" is hopeless, it will rejoice my heart to find it
" done by authority from *home.*"

Another Correspondent, also long resident in

Bengal, and before referred to by me, observes:—

"On occasions of Suttee, there does not exist "any common feeling, either religious or national, "to be excited into danger; and the Bengal Go- "vernment has often encountered, and overcome, "a thousand times more danger, by imposing a "new tax, than it will ever be exposed to, by abo- "lishing Suttees.

"The Government has nothing to fear from "charges for being wanting in Toleration. With- "in the last few years, it has erected Colleges, both "for Mahommedans and Hindoos, has appointed "a Committee of public Instruction, for promoting "the objects of those Institutions, but, above all, "has nobly manifested its parental character "throughout the land, by conferring rank and "honours on benevolent Natives, not for any "immediate service to the State, but for having "contributed of their substance to promote the "welfare of their fellow-creatures. A decisive "measure for the abolition of Suttees, would only "be in consistency with all this humane conduct."

A long Resident in India, who is now in this country, writes:—

"As to the question of the practicability of abo- "lition by law, this may perhaps be answered by "another question:—What, 50 years ago, would "have been said of the practicability of taxing *Brah-* "*minical lands*, the exaction of which tax was an "inroad made upon a prejudice of the whole po-

" pulation at once; yet no inconvenience followed;
" while the prohibition of the Suttee system would
" affect but certain portions of the population, nor
" those all at once, but in insulated cases, as they
" occurred; so that to forebode any evil conse-
" quences to the Governors, or the Governed, is, I
" humbly conceive, quite unnecessary, and, after
" what Government have done, and I think very
" properly done, is a consideration, so foreign and
" remote from the question, as to become too tri-
" fling for grave and serious thought. The pre-
" judices of the whole community have been, from
" time immemorial, actually encroached upon; yet
" Government had no question of the wisdom, or
" justice, or expediency of those measures. No
" ill effects have followed—none ever will follow."

After these Evidences, what becomes of the fears which are entertained, and which are entirely of our own creation?

With what feelings of astonishment would a Native learn that we apprehended public disquietude from the saving of life! Supposing him to overcome his natural disbelief in the possibility of such an alarm, what a complete change must take place in his ideas, before he could compress the gigantic power of the British Nation, into a size likely to be affected by a handful of his unwarlike countrymen!

In further proof that this practice is *local* and *limited* in its extent, and only partially observed, I refer to the following authorities.

The chief support of this odious practice centres in Bengal. In the western provinces, peopled with a bold and hardy race, Female Immolation is exceedingly rare. This will best appear from the following Evidences.

Extract of a letter from Mr. EWER, the Superintendant of Police in the Lower Provinces, to the Governor General in Council, dated Calcutta, 18th of November, 1818.

"The practice may be almost called local, for "during the years 1815-16, and 17, 864 Suttees "took place in the five Zillahs of Burdwan, "Hooghley, the Jungle Mehauls, Nuddea, and "Calcutta, while in the same period, only 663 took "place throughout the remainder of our exten-"sive empire, including the holy city of Benares, "in which only 41 were performed, although its "population is almost exclusively Hindoo, and "every meritorious act is there of double value. "I cannot attempt to account for the great preva-"lence of Suttees in some districts, and the rarity "of it in others, but it is a proof that it is a cus-"tom *seldom thought of in the greater portion of "our dominions.*"—Vol. 1. p. 228.

Extract of a letter from a Civil Officer of the Company, long stationed at Madras.

"This practice is unknown to the Hindoos of "the western coast of the Peninsula, and upon an "attempt on the part of some inhabitants of My-"sore, to burn their widows, the people of Canara "rose up voluntarily, and put a stop to the pro-"ceeding."

Extract of a letter from Mr. OAKELEY, Magistrate of Hooghley.

"I have been informed on good authority, that "it is comparatively but little known beyond the "Districts in the vicinity of Calcutta. If enjoined "by the Religion of the Hindoos, why does it pre- "vail in one place more than in another, and why "is that one place in the immediate neighbourhood "of the Presidency? If Suttees were really an "act enjoined by Religion, it would be universally "meritorious, and equally observed wherever that "Religion is followed; but as it is not, we must "look for its prevalence in the neighbourhood of "Calcutta, to some peculiar circumstances affect- "ing their moral character. It is notorious that "the Natives of Calcutta, and its vicinity, exceed "all others in profligacy and immorality of con- "duct; the idol of the drunkard, and the thief, "(Kallee,) is scarcely to be met with in the distant "provinces, and there they perform their ceremo- "nies in darkness and secrecy, and none but the "most abandoned will confess that he is a follower "of Kallee. In Calcutta, we find few that are not. "The Murderer, the Robber, and the Prostitute, "all aim to propitiate a being, whose worship is "obscenity, who delights in the blood of man and "beast, and without imploring whose aid, no act "of wickedness or debauchery is committed, or "contemplated. The worship of Kallee must "harden the hearts of her followers, and to them

" scenes of blood and crime must become familiar. " By such men a Suttee is not regarded as a *Re-* " *ligious act,* but as a choice entertainment, and " we may fairly conclude, that the vicious propen- " sities of the Hindoos, in the vicinity of Calcutta, " are a cause of the comparative prevalence of the " custom."—Vol. 1. p. 237. *

Mr. WARNER, Magistrate of the Twenty-four Pergunnahs asks, by Letter of December, 1818, " Is the custom prevalent throughout India; or is it " confined in a great degree to the Districts adja- " cent to the Presidency?" And he adds, " Look " at the statements—they exhibit a class of people " who must have been generally ignorant of the " Shasters."—Vol. 1. p. 239.

Mr. HARINGTON, the Judge of the Court of Ni-

* In proof of the uniform excess in the Calcutta District, the Governor General in Council observes, in 1822, that the total number of the Calcutta division " still maintains its proportion of " nine sixteenths, or something more than half of the grand total " for the whole Bengal Territory." And in transmitting the Returns of 1823, on the 3rd of December, 1824, he remarks that " the total number of Suttees reported in 1823, in the whole 52 " Jurisdictions of Bengal was 575, of which number no less " than 500 were included in the 9 Districts, in the division of " Calcutta, and in the 6 Districts of Benares, Ghazeepore, Goruck- " pore, Shahabad, Dacca, and Backergunge, leaving only 75 " cases distributed amongst the remaining 37 Jurisdictions, and " that the Reports of all the preceding years, afford a similar " proof of the greater prevalence of this barbarous practice in " the particular Districts above referred to."—Vol. 4. p. 152.

zamut Adawlut, in his Report to the Governor General in Council, dated the 28th of June, 1823, after nine years experience of the Prohibitory Regulations, writes:—

"Were this practice universal or prevalent to a "great extent amongst all classes of Hindoos in "every part of our territories, there might be some "ground for apprehending that a sudden interdic- "tion of it, would produce an alarming degree of "discontent, and possibly of combined resistance. "But we know the fact to be, that the custom pre- "vails chiefly in Bengal, being founded princi- "pally on Authorities that have a local estimation "in that Province. The official Reports further "shew that it has but a partial prevalence even in "Bengal, few or no Suttees having occurred for "several years in some Districts, particularly in "the Moorshedabad Division. The aggregate "number also in the whole of the Provinces, under "this Presidency, large as it justly appears on the "separate valuation of individual human life, is but "small when we compare it with the total number "of Hindoo females, who annually become Wi- "dows in the Provinces, or with the number who "survive their Husbands from year to year, in op- "position to the more limited usage of self-de- "votion.

"It is not easy to form any accurate calculation; "but supposing the entire Hindoo population of the "Territories, under this Presidency, to be 50 mil- "lions, and the annual deaths to be one in 33, or

"above 1½ million—a sixth of this number, or "250,000, might on a general computation, be as- "sumed as the annual number of Hindoo females, "becoming Widows, of whom little more than 600 "devote themselves on the death of their Hus- "bands."—Vol. 4. p. 11.

Only 600, then, out of 250,000! are sacrificed in one Presidency. What becomes then of the other 249,400? Would any Native himself be weak enough to imagine that all those would come to future destruction, because they were not burnt in this world?

"The truth is," says the late Accountant General, a Correspondent before referred to, "that the "practice of Suttees is so limited, that even in the "few places where it most prevails, not one in "thirty of the Natives, present at a Suttee, feel "any particular interest in what is going forward. "Deduct those which annually occur in the imme- "diate vicinity of Calcutta, and there will then "remain very few to express what is felt on this "point by all the numberless families throughout "the vast extent of our territories in India."

In proof that the practice is not of permanent obligation, even where it has once obtained, we find from the Parliamentary papers,—Vol. 1. p. 30; that "It is fallen into disuse in some entire Districts, "and is discountenanced in Tirhoot, by the prin- "cipal Hindoo inhabitants." In addition to which, and in further proof that it has repeatedly yielded to the force of external circumstances, and is not

of universal obligation, may be here introduced, the argument of

Precedents from Foreign Governments.

Bernier states the practice of Suttees to have been greatly discouraged and diminished, though not entirely suppressed, by the Mahometan Government; but it has revived, and increased, since our dominion began. And it is stated in Vol. 1. p. 25., of the Parliamentary papers, (to the same effect,) that "the Mussulman, who never protected "the unhappy Natives from foreign invasion or "from internal commotion, checked this practice "in many cases, and in some Provinces abolished "it altogether."

One of the first acts of the great Albuquerque, was to prohibit the continuance of this scourge. He would not suffer such an outrage upon moral feeling to be committed in the face of a Christian community, which possessed the means of abolishing it. The fruits of this interdiction exist to the present period, and the commentaries of his Son, Bras de Albuquerque contain the following remarkable record of this fact. "When Alfred de "Albuquerque took the kingdom of Goa, he would "not permit that any Woman, from thenceforward, "should burn herself; and although to change their "custom is equal to death, they yet rejoiced in "life, and spoke great good of him, because he "commanded that they should not burn themselves."

It has been already observed, that in the *Island*

of Bombay, the practice never was permitted, before it was ceded to England, and that in that particular portion of our Empire, it has never been revived.

The French, and Dutch, have ever invariably prevented the practice, throughout the whole of their possessions in the East.

The practice is not permitted in the Foreign Settlements.

Mr. FORBES, the first Judge of the Calcutta Court of Circuit, by Letter to the Supreme Court, dated 5th August, 1819, says,

"At the Foreign Settlements of Chundernagore, "Chinsurah, and Serampore, Suttees are not per- "mitted by the Local Authorities, nor were they, "during the period that these places were in our "possession.

"In the territory of Delhi, the late Resident, Mr. "METCALFE, never, when apprized of the intention, "permitted the burning of a Widow to take place, "and was prepared to prevent the practice, when- "ever necessary, by forcible interference, but "which was requisite only on one occasion that "came under his immediate observation."—Vol. 1. p. 243.

Another Witness—a Correspondent of my own —observes,

"As to the Suttee practice, it is not of *equal* "*universal* prevalence as some Hindoo rites; but "where Hindooism is in perfection, compared with "other places, *there* it *least obtains*, which proves

" it not essential to the integrity of the Hindoo " Religion."

In proof that the practice obtains most among the poor and ignorant.

Mr. FORBES, the first Judge of the Calcutta Court of Circuit, observes, by his Letter to the Superior Court of Nizamut Adawlut, dated 5th August, 1819, which I have quoted before—

" It appears from the Reports furnished by the " Magistrates, that the practice is prevalent among " the most ignorant and deluded of the people, " while the numerous instances of the Widows of " the higher classes, continuing to live in affluence " and respectability, afford the most satisfactory " evidence that there is no imperious call to sub- " mit to, no dire disgrace attending the rejection " of, the dread alternative."—Vol. I. p. 243.

Perhaps I may here add, in reference to the class of society in which the horrid practice may appear to obtain most, that on 15th August, 1822, there was an Order of Government issued to report upon the circumstances of the husband, the Court of Nizamut Adawlut stating that it was " to enable " Government to judge of the degree in which the " Rite prevails amongst the more opulent and better " educated classes, or whether it is confined to the " poor and ignorant."

If this discovery would have been of any real importance, it is effectually invalidated by a declaration of the same Legal Court on 23d July, 1824, that " it will be sufficient to furnish such informa-

" tion on the subject, as the Police Officers may be " enabled to learn from common report." Precious information!

It has, however, been objected, and therefore may now again be objected, that ANY ATTEMPTS OF THIS KIND WILL BE AN INTERFERENCE WITH THE PREJUDICES OF THE HINDOOS.

To this I answer, that the whole History of the British Empire in India has been necessarily one incessant interference with the Prejudices of the people, whenever it was obviously necessary for the purposes of our own Government, and for the interests and happiness of the Natives, that such interference should be exercised.

In proof that Prejudices long deemed invincible, have been completely overcome, we need only refer to the change introduced about thirty-five years since, by which the British Government granted to all classes of land holders an hereditary property in their estates—a privilege, till then, unknown in Asia; when the rents to be paid to Government, which, as Sovereign of the country, thus claimed to be Proprietor of the soil throughout all India, were equitably and unalterably settled.

Again—the most important reforms have taken place in the Judicial system; and even in the Military, the most confirmed principles and habits of a Religious character have been often quietly overcome; and, in others, have fallen into disuse. Nay; things have already happened even in our own times, which Sir W. JONES, however pas-

sionate a lover of liberty he was, dared not to anticipate, in the case of the Natives, whom, with pain, he had, but a few years before, *pronounced* to be given up to an unmitigated and unalterable despotism.

Perhaps I may add, without any breach of confidence, the testimony of Sir W. JONES's Biographer, Lord TEIGNMOUTH, who has lately assured me, that he never expected to live to behold the extraordinary improvement which has taken place in the Religious, Moral, and Political condition of India, since his Lordship was in office there.

If any should say, the cases above adverted to are not strictly Religious, I will advert to those which are purely so, and ask them how they can account for that immense number of Mahometans, estimated at from ten to fifteen millions, scattered over India, most of whom are supposed, by the best judges, to be converts from the Hindoo faith?

Again—what will they say to the whole Nation of the Seiks, of whom Sir J. MALCOLM gave so interesting an account, who adore but one God, omnipotent, and omnipresent; and, of course, reject a plurality of Deities, and renounce Brahma and Vishnu with all their incarnations? They are so numerous as to be supposed able to raise 200,000 horse, and yet they have, within a few centuries, forsaken the Hindoo faith, and freed themselves from its intolerable restrictions and superstitions.

The followers of Bhudha also, who reject caste, are very numerous; besides which, different sects

have notoriously sprung up from time to time, within the pale of the Hindoo faith itself—just as in other countries. Mr. ORME says, every Province has fifty sects of Gentoos, and every sect adheres to different observances.

I shall do no more here than merely advert to the Native Christians in India, because I do not feel it necessary to my present purpose, to rest particularly on that argument; but it is impossible, so far, to lay out of sight the Religious profession of Christian England, which is now introduced into India, by legislative provision, as not to remind this Court, that, at the very moment in which I am addressing them, there exist in India hundreds of thousands of Native Christians, the greater part of whom became such, before the public profession of Christianity was made the subject of legislation for that immense Empire; and even before this event took place, it is equally certain that millions of Hindoos were converted to the gross imposture of the Mahometan delusion, all of which is evidently so much invasion of, and departure from, the Religious prejudices, and the Religious profession of the Indian nation.

The Hindoo law sanctions, under some shape or another, a variety of evils which it is the undisguised object of our whole Judicial system to oppose. It is full of sanguinary punishments for crimes committed against Brahmins by Plebeians, but the British law has never sanctioned one.

This would apply, even, if the Hindoo law en-

joined the practice of Suttee, which it no where does, while their principal Legislator opposes it in distinct terms.

It rests on the doctrine, not of the Religious expediency of the Hindoos, but on the doctrine of the Political expediency of the British.

The subjecting of the Brahmins to the operation of our Laws, is, perhaps, the strongest point. Their own Laws invest them with the loftiest prerogatives, and absolutely forbid their being made amenable to any Human Laws. They forbid the Magistrate to imagine evil against them. Thus fenced by the laws, extolled by their sacred books, and all but deified by the veneration of the people, how were Brahmins to be punished, without violating the most awful sanctions of their Religion, and invading the dearest prejudices of the people? To have exempted them from punishment would have been to deliver up the country to desolation and murder. How then did we act? Did we respect the Shasters or obey the Pundits? No; the rights of society were consulted, and they were tried publicly like common delinquents, and subjected to the degradation of the gibbet. This has been repeated ever since, and scarcely a year has elapsed, without the Execution of these favorites of Heaven and idols of the earth, by the hands of the common hangman, in some one of the Provinces of the Empire. Have the Natives complained of this outrage on the sanctity of their Priesthood, or considered it an infringement of Religious toleration? Rather; have they not afforded every facility in ridding the earth

of such monsters, and ever applauded the justice of our equal laws? Let any one read the account of Nundkomar's Execution in Calcutta, about fifty years ago, when our Indian Empire was in its infancy, small in extent, and surrounded by enemies who ruled three-fourths of the Continent, yet, when the law pronounced him guilty, he paid its forfeit in the rising Metropolis of a new power, in the midst of 200,000 of his own countrymen, and when it was of the first importance to conciliate our new subjects. If ever there was a time when public feeling might have been expected to manifest itself, it was when the law was first carried into execution against one of this sacred tribe, by a handful of strangers, opposed to an enormous crowd, which yet, after witnessing the Execution, returned peaceably to their own homes.—Vol. 4. p. 23.

We have thus departed, already, farther than we can do, for the inviolability of the Priesthood is a fundamental principle of the Hindoo law; while the burning of Widows is a mere excrescence from the corrupt soil of polytheism. The question, therefore is, not whether we shall, for the first time, infringe popular prejudice to establish the sovereignty of justice, but whether having commenced this career, we shall go forward, and liberate the country from a practice which fills it with innocent blood.

I shall now advert to the remarkable cases of invasion of Religious prejudices occurring at Saugor, Juanpore, and Guzerat.

1st. With regard to the Isle of Saugor—when

the Marquis Wellesley understood that a practice prevailed there of sacrificing, at the change of every moon, many victims, chiefly Children, to the river Ganges, he expressed a desire to interfere. He was told that the practice had subsisted for many Centuries, perhaps from time immemorial, but he issued a law declaring the practice to be thenceforth Murder, punishable by death. It was obeyed without a murmur, when first promulgated in the presence of thousands assembled together, and the Proclamation is read to this hour, every half year, at the two great festivals of the Snaun Jattra, where the military attend, and have been seen to rescue Women from the water dripping wet, while the mob, so far from being disposed to riot, have followed these very women with cheers, as the same people would thoughtlessly have done to her Sacrifice.*

2. The second instance of a conquest already

* As it has been objected that Infanticide is not enjoined, or authorized, by the Shasters, and therefore, not an analogous case; we shall do well to hear a competent witness on that point, Mr. Ewer, Superintendant of Police in the Lower Provinces, Dated, Calcutta, 18th Nov. 1818.

"Although I am aware that the exposure of Infants at Saugor and other places, and the Murder of female offspring by the Rajkoomars are neither of them duties, either directly enjoined or authorized by the Shasters, yet I submit that the exposure of Infants is in consequence of vows made by the Mother, for the purpose of obtaining some favor from the Gods; and that the fulfilment of such is meritorious in the highest degree." [He might have added, religiously necessary, in their esteem, as evincing gratitude to the Deity.]—Vol. 1. p. 229.

achieved over the Native superstitions and cruelties of India is still more striking. It is now above twenty years since Mr. DUNCAN (afterwards Governor of Bombay) then resident at Benares, learned that a custom existed, among a particular Tribe in that neighbourhood, of murdering their Female Infants—and he was able, through the influence of the British Government, which, at least in this instance, was used, not only innocuously, but successfully, to prevail on a whole tribe, the Rajkoomars of Juanpore, to enter into a positive engagement to abstain in future from such detestable acts; and that any of their number who should be guilty of them, should be expelled from their Tribe. This Agreement will be found in the Parliamentary Papers, as well as in the 4th volume of the Transactions of the Asiatic Society.

3. Thus the practice was abolished in Juanpore, but it had been suggested to Mr. DUNCAN that it prevailed in the neighbourhood of Guzerat. After some enquiry, he ascertained that the practice of murdering the Female Infants was very general among the Tribes of Jarejah and Cutch, and so firmly had this detestable custom rooted itself, as to have overcome the strongest of human instincts, a Mother's love for her Infant. Not only did these Mothers assist in destroying their offspring, but even when the Mussulman's feelings (stronger, to our shame be it spoken, than our own) occasionally interfered to preserve their offspring, the Tribes held these Females in such contempt as to attach to their families a forfeiture of their military caste.

Governor DUNCAN's humane designs against this horrid practice were most ably and effectually seconded, and at length, accomplished by the Resident, COLONEL WALKER. The whole progress of this admirable enterprise is published to the world; and the leading particulars will be found in "Moor's Hindoo Infanticide" printed by the House of Commons. COLONEL WALKER's attempt, at first, wore a very unpromising aspect. He wrote to one of the Chieftains of the Tribe, reasoning with him on the cruelty of the practice, and urging him to discontinue it. I will read his answer which would have discouraged and intimidated a less zealous adventurer. The Chief says "it was notorious that the Jarejahs had been "in the habit of killing their daughters for 4,900 "years; and that, no doubt, he was aware that all of "God's creation, even the mighty Emperors of "Hindustan, SHAH JEHAN, AURENGZEBE, and "AKBAR, had always preserved friendship with his "Court, and had never acted, in respect of Female "Infanticide, unreasonably. Even the King of the "World had never once thought of putting a stop "to the custom which prevails among the Jarejahs "of killing their daughters." His Highness then concludes with a threatening allusion to his own power as follows:—"No one has until this day "wantonly quarrelled with the DURBAR who has "not, in the end, suffered loss."—"This DURBAR "wishes no one ill, nor has ever wantonly quar- "relled with any one."—"Do not address me

" again on this subject." Even one of the Mothers returned him an answer of the same hopeless tenor. Now most persons would have thought this a decisive proof that it was dangerous to proceed in the attempt, and that any one who had persevered after this, might have been expected to be called a Fanatic and Enthusiast. If COLONEL WALKER had left off here, he might even have obtained the praise of having done his best, in this work of humanity, though he had not been able to achieve it, but he was not so easily disheartened; his humanity was not satisfied with enjoying this barren and unprofitable triumph—he persevered, and, within twelve months, the very writers of those Letters I have mentioned, together with the Jarejah tribes, in general, formally abjured the future practice of Infanticide, and declared themselves highly satisfied with their engagement. About two years afterwards, he was in that neighbourhood, when some of the Infants which had been preserved, were brought to his tent. Now hear his own account of the scene. " It was extremely gratifying, on this " occasion, to observe the triumph of nature, feel " ing, and parental affection, over prejudice, and " a horrid superstition; and that those who, but a " short period before, would (as many of them had " done) have doomed their Infants to destruction, " without compunction, should now glory in their " preservation, and doat on them with fondness. " The Jarejah Fathers who but a short time back,

" would not have listened to the preservation of " their daughters, now exhibited them with pride " and fondness. Their Mothers and Nurses also " attended on this interesting occasion. True " to the feelings which are found in other Countries " to prevail so forcibly, the emotions of nature " here exhibited were extremely moving. The " Mothers placed their Infants in the hands of " COLONEL WALKER, calling on him, and their Gods, " to protect what he alone had taught them to " preserve—while they emphatically called these " Infants, HIS Children."

This practice was declared Murder by Regulation 3 of the year 1804.—See Vol 5, p. 12.

If it be said—Infanticide still goes on—I admit it, with the deepest regret. The whole 5th Vol. proves it does: and this is a reflection on the imbecility and indolence of COLONEL WALKER'S Successors who did not follow up his exertions, nor act upon the declared determination of the Governor General in Council to stop the practice. It is proved from the Parliamentary Papers, that when we had the Agreements of the Natives in our hands to abandon this practice, we never enforced them, and defeated, by the most culpable negligence, the whole of the good which had been effected—the strongest proof that only a general law, which is not dependent on the disposition or indisposition of particular individuals, ever will, or can, avail effectually. *

* An impression having here arisen that the Speaker alluded to an Hon. Director, it afforded him the greatest satisfaction to be

The violations of Hindoo Law have been further effected, in matters of Religion, in the case of

enabled to assure the Court that so far from having intended any such reference, he felt it due to that Gentleman to state that it was abundantly proved in the 5th Vol. of the Parliamentary Papers, that if one person rather than another had seconded the humane designs of COLONEL WALKER, and done his utmost to give effect to those intentions, it was that respected Individual.—It would have been still more gratifying to the feelings of the Speaker, and he thinks he may add, to those of the Proprietors at large—if it had appeared, as the discussion proceeded, that the views of the Hon. Director had sustained no change, since he held office in India. As it however unfortunately happened that the least equivocal opposition which was offered to the Motion, was contained in a Speech which was read by that Hon. Director, and as no opportunity for a Reply occurred at the time, it is not doubted that the candor of his mind, and his esteem for truth, will permit a few observations on that Speech in the present form.

The Hon. Director observed that "the material error of our "system of Government in India was, that we were too prone to "innovation." . . . . . "too apt to overlook our own "former bigotry, superstition and prejudice, and to forget that "our emancipation was effected, not by any sudden, compul-"sive, or coercive reformation, but by the gradual hand of time, "the unshackled reflections of reason, and the salutary diffusion "of those great principles of truth, which have at length placed "us on the pinnacle of refinement."—To which it may be replied that our long acquiescence in all the turpitude of a sanguinary Idolatry assuredly affords no evidence of an appetite for "Inno-"vation;" and that the Motion which the Hon. Director was opposing, proposed neither "sudden, compulsive, nor coercive, reformation," but left to THE DIRECTORS themselves, both the time and mode of effecting an object, admitted, on all hands, to be most desirable in itself.

He proceeded to observe that "in legislating for the East, we "should remember that the people have, for unrecorded ages, "been the slaves of a custom which it is now proposed to snap

the Brahminical practice of sitting *Dhurnah*, as it is termed; that is, remaining at the door of a

" asunder at one blow." [Certainly the proposed Motion contem-
" plated no such violence] " a custom, which however abhor-
" rent to our feelings, and revolting to *our* Religion, was, he
" feared, too deeply interwoven with *theirs*, to be rashly sev-
" ered from the kindred branch with which it had been hitherto
" nurtured"—in other words, that a Religion which has been now proved to the British Parliament, on indubitable testimony, to sanction, and necessitate, the destruction of at least Six Thousand Women by the flames in nine years—to say nothing of the multitudes of both sexes, and all ages, destroyed in the same period by drowning, burying alive, and other violent deaths, is " a custom" which, because it has existed " for unrecorded ages," is " not to be rashly severed from its kindred branch," but that, on the contrary, he who is declared in Holy Scripture to be " a Murderer from the beginning," ought still to be permitted to hold those whom the Hon. Director himself admits to be the " slaves " of a cruel degradation, which he also admits to be " abhorrent to our feelings, and revolting to our Religion;" notwithstanding that, upon the most abundant testimony, it can no longer be doubted that we have the power to put an end to all this guilt and misery, and have already disgraced ourselves, for above half a Century, by permitting it to go on as we have done.

He proceeded, however, to state more plainly, that " these " habits—the uninterrupted growth of centuries, springing from " sentiments, which however erroneous, can *hardly be termed* " *vicious*, cannot, and ought not, to be violently eradicated."

As it is not necessary to attempt to prove, in this country, that " sentiments," which issue in nothing less than bloodshed, *ought* to be termed vicious by every Director of the East India Company, and equally unnecessary to attempt to shew that a declaration, that they can " hardly be termed vicious," will not alter their character, or divest them of their moral stain—it is not my purpose to do more than merely to notice this observation, and pass on.

A parallel is next attempted to be drawn between " the feel-
" ing which prompts a human being to prefer death to infamy,

person with whom they have some object to carry, so as to prevent ingress or egress, and offering

" which urges the European to sacrifice his life, in preference to " his honour, and which bids the Hindoo throw herself on the " burning pile of her dead husband."—But I ask, what analogy is there between the Suicide or Duelling of Europe, (neither of which are sanctioned by any—even the most corrupt—form of European religion, and both of which are positively forbidden by all European laws,) and the sanguinary Superstitions of India, which profess to derive sanction from her Religion, and are promoted and countenanced by her National Priesthood, as at once atoning for sin, and essential to salvation. The cases have just nothing in common. But if it were otherwise; is it seriously meant to be argued that because Suicide and Duelling exist in Europe, therefore that the existence of such crimes can justify the wide-spread bloodshed of India?—Is it meant to be gravely alledged, that so long as insanity shall lead to Self-destruction among ourselves, or some less venial cause shall occasion Duelling, we are to suffer the Murders to be perpetrated, by authority, which have so long gone on in India, and refuse to employ the power which the Almighty has placed in our hands, for the god-like purpose of saving human life, merely because some persons among ourselves voluntarily embrue their hands in their own blood, or by an absurd appeal to the arbitrary, and often inequitable, decision of a Duel, chuse to hazard the destruction of their own souls and bodies, as well as those of their fellow Christians? Are these, I will ask, in the first place, such reasons as we might expect to be afforded *from authority*, for the continuance of Human Sacrifices in India, or in the second place, are they such as should determine us to yield to their cogency?

The Hon. Director, however, proceeded to observe, that the feeling which bids the Hindoo Woman to burn herself was one " which, however deplorable in its effects, is still, from its origin, " entitled to a *certain respect;* it is a feeling which must be com- " bated by reason, not with penal prohibitions; and emanating " as it does from *a misdirected greatness of soul*, it demands at " least this concession." I should be sorry (although not a Fel-

violence to themselves if molested;—both which are clear Religious practices, deriving authority

low of the Antiquarian Society) to be wanting in respect for any of the customs of Antiquity. and equally sorry, (although not a Divine) to be deficient in respect for any "greatness of soul" which has survived the ruins of the fall; but when it is clearly established that the custom in question is plainly prohibited by a Revelation from Heaven—is equally opposed to the Religion of Nature, antecedent to any expression of the Divine will—is an opprobrium upon any equitable government which has even no higher view than the mere political and civil interests of its own subjects—and is not less an outrage upon every feeling of our common humanity, I honestly confess that my respect, for all this "misdirected greatness of soul" will not carry me so far as to concede to the Hon. Director, that Legislative provisions may not wisely and righteously be resorted to, by a Paternal Government for the protection of the wretched victims of Priestcraft, nor can I discover any valid pretence—after Human Reason has for centuries done its best to terminate such evils, and only demonstrated its own impotence—for saying that Human Law ought not to interpose for the salvation of Human Life against the effects of a desolating Tyranny, alike abhorrent to God, and destructive to his Creatures.

We have next an Opinion stated by the Hon. Director, that "a Legislative interdiction of a custom which has prevailed for "ages, would be calculated to increase the evil, instead of cor- "recting it, and that" . . . "we might be compelled "to witness the committal of suicide in a variety of forms, in "substitution of the Sacrifice by Suttee"—in answer to which opinion, I have only to refer to that part of my Argument, where the objection that these crimes, on any attempt to suppress them, would be committed less publicly, will be fully considered. (See page 241).

It only remains to notice the concluding Prediction of the Hon. Director, that "the prohibition would be an engine "in the hands of the Priests to excite the minds of those "who might have a disposition to sacrifice" . . . "and "that, in a political point of view it may be made the instrument "of misrepresentation of our views as to the Religious propen-

from the Shaster. [See Vol. 5. pp. 8 and 9.] These, however, are expressly made criminal by the 21st

" sities of the Natives, and derange and obstruct those great " principles of improvement which are happily making such " rapid advances in the cultivation of a closer intercourse with " our Native fellow subjects, and in the means provided for the " diffusion of Education."

Now it would rather appear to me that the Political expediency which would still leave the Priests to destroy " our " Native fellow-subjects," under the guise of Religion, is more likely to defeat, than further, the object which the Hon. Director professes to have in view; because such an unhallowed sacrifice of Truth at the shrine of a corrupt Policy, can never look for the blessing of God upon it, but can only deserve and expect His frown; and I apprehend that so far from expecting derangement or obstruction to the " great principles of improvement," or " the diffusion of education," from speaking out like Christians and men, and calling Murder by its right name, we may rather expect that the continued Toleration of so much crime, on the part of those who profess to be better taught, will of all other things, be more likely to lead the Priests and their People, alike, to think but meanly of a system which has no better influence upon our own conduct, than to render us only quick-sighted when our pecuniary interests are concerned, but which leaves us careless and indifferent in those cases where the honour of God, and the happiness of his Creatures are at stake. The truth is—and why should we fear to tell it?—that our long recklessness of the lives of our fellow-subjects, and our long permission of the foulest bloodshed, are far more likely to retard our schemes of Civilization, and cripple our Moral exertions in India, than could ever follow from an attention to that common Honesty which is invariably the best Policy; all the deviations from a purer profession—whatever we may think of it—are very easily detected by the Natives, even under all the disadvantages of their inferior light. Their natural good sense is quick to discern the gross inconsistencies of those who " call themselves Christians," and who are yet content to leave a corrupt Priesthood in possession of the power to perpetrate Murder on a large scale, without account, under

Regulation of the year 1795, entitled, "A Regu- "lation for preventing (among other things) Brah- "mins in the province of Benares from wounding "or killing their Female Relations, or Children, or "Sitting Dhurnah." Which Law was passed by the Governor General in Council on the 28th of August, 1795. From the Religious observance of sitting Dhurnah, the Brahmins are frequently obliged to desist, and are constantly punished for it by the Officers of the Courts of Justice. Indeed, without this, the course of justice could not go on, as the practice is absolutely opposed to English rule. It was afterwards discovered that the practice of Sitting Dhurnah obtained in the province of

the false apprehension that, if these men were deprived of their iniquitous gains, they would excite the minds of the people against us, misrepresent our views, and prevent the improvements which we meditate.

It is a timid and unstatesmanlike policy of *this* character, which is likely to offer obstruction to Moral culture, and to the progress of Education, much rather than an honest determination to discharge our duty before God and man; in pursuing which course, we shall not only be able to throw ourselves back upon our own consciences, but may be equally sure of finding on our side, even the consciences of the Heathens themselves, no one of whom is ignorant, even under that unwritten law which he brought into the world with him, that bloodshed is contrary to the mind and will of Him "whose tender mercies are over "all his works," and who "has not left Himself without wit- "ness" even in the breast of the most uncultivated Savage, much less in that of the more enlightened Hindoo.

To all such alarms as have been adverted to, whether real, or professed, I venture to oppose a single line of Dr. YOUNG:

"Be good! and let Heaven answer for the rest."

Behar; and a Law was promulgated, to punish the same offence in Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, which is Regulation 5, A. D. 1797.

A Civil Officer of the Company, long resident in India, but now in England, writes:—

"I hesitate not to affirm, that far greater interference with the Religious prejudices of the Natives, has been exercised by the Indian Government, in furtherance of their Judicial and Revenue system, than they would be called upon to exercise in the suppression of Suttees.—First: as to the Criminal system. The strong attachment of the Natives of India to *caste* is well known. The extreme reverence in which the Brahmin is held, and the contempt cast upon the Pariar, or Outcast, are well known. The Government has long disregarded all these prejudices in affixing one penalty to crimes committed by the Brahmin against the Pariar, and vice versâ; and I may with safety affirm, that the not unfrequent spectacle in India of a Brahmin publicly executed by the hands of the Pariar Executioner; while, in cases of less consequence, the Brahmin and the Pariar constantly stand at one bar, and when convicted, work together on the roads, though as flagrant violations of Religious feeling as any the people can be called to witness, are yet daily passing before their eyes, without remonstrance or disturbance. Again: Sorcery and Witchcraft are intimately connected with the Religion of the people, but to these the British

" Government pays no respect in its Laws, but " denounces as Criminals all persons who revenge " what they conscientiously believe are the devices " of Witchcraft against them or their Relations. " Again: Nothing is more abhorrent to the Hin- " doo than a sea voyage: it involves *necessarily*, " loss of caste, yet when it suited the purposes " of the Indian Government, they have, without " scruple, embarked their regiments for foreign " service. In the last Burmese war, the Madras " Native Troops were not, as in former instances, " requested to volunteer for service beyond seas, " but commanded; and if in former cases this act " may be termed the spontaneous act of the Troops, " it clearly demonstrates that when the interest of " the European Officers, and the Government, is " exerted to abolish Religious prejudice in the na- " tive mind, it is effected with ease. Let but " one half of the influence of Government be put " forth to abolish the practice of Widow's burn- " ing, and in a few years we shall have no more of " it. After these examples, I ask, what excuse is " there for not proceeding a step further, and tell- " ing the Native, whatever may be the prejudice, " the Government deems it necessary that Women " should not be put to death?"

It will be evident, from all this reasoning, that when the political and pecuniary interests of England have been in question, we have felt no hesitation respecting the invasion of the Prejudices of our Indian subjects; the infringement of their more sacred Rites, or the destruction of their most re-

vered Instructors. And why, when their own *lives* are in question, and their own interests are at stake, are we to refuse our aid, on the mere pretext that they will then for the first time resent our interference, when it can be shewn to be more pure and disinterested than when exercised on any former occasion.

The duty, then, of proceeding farther than we have yet done, appears indispensable; and the timid and reptile policy which would keep us back from an obvious duty, ought to have no effect on our decision. Who that sees Great Britain yet upon her Throne, after a conflict in which she has survived the united assaults of the European nations; and since which period, she has equally triumphed over the arts and arms of her Oriental enemies—who that beholds her "sitting as a Queen," and after having humbled the Tyrant of Europe, and raised the nations he had oppressed, now legislating, in peace, for her own remote Empire in the East—who that beholds her enriched by Commerce, and ennobled by Conquest, will hesitate to pronounce that this is peculiarly the time for her to interpose for the deliverance of her own Subjects from the oppression of a sanguinary Superstition, and to prove to the world that she has herself been preserved, amidst surrounding ruin, for no ordinary purposes? Once more: let Sir William Jones be heard: "Providence has thrown these Territories "into the arms of Britain, for their protection and "welfare."

An argument may now be drawn in favour of

the Abolition of this practice, from THE CONDUCT OF THE NATIVES THEMSELVES. Even some of these, by the mere influence of the light of Nature, and the operation of the common feelings of Humanity, are evidently awakening to a sense of the evils of their own corrupt practices, and are reasoning with each other on the subject; "if haply they "might feel after God, and find him." Among other Publications of this nature, I have read Ramohun Roy's Translation of the Ishopanishad, which that intelligent Native (although born and educated a Brahmin) has brought before the Indian Public, for the purpose of shewing that it treats the practice of Suttee as a fatal error in Religion, and involving the violation of every humane and social feeling.

This work was published in Calcutta in 1816. "Living constantly," says he, "among Hindoos "of different sects and professions, I have had "ample opportunity of observing the superstitious "puerilities into which they have been thrown by "their self-interested guides, who have succeeded "but too well, in defiance of the Law, as well "as of common sense. The least aberration in "Diet forfeits caste; while Murder, Theft, or Per-"jury, though brought home by a judicial sen-"tence, is visited with no peculiar mark of in-"famy or disgrace. I have never ceased to con-"template, with the strongest feelings of regret, "the obstinate adherence of my Countrymen to "their fatal system, inducing, for the sake of

" propitiating their supposed Deities, the viola-
" tion of every humane and social feeling, more
" especially in *the dreadful acts of Self-destruc-*
" *tion, and the Immolation of the nearest Rela-*
" *tions, under the delusion of conforming to Reli-*
" *gious rites.* I view in them the moral debase-
" ment of a race who are capable of better
" things."

Again. Ramohun Roy declares that " the
" Brahmins find in the rites, ceremonies, and
" festivals of idolatry, the source of their com-
" forts and fortune, and therefore advance and
" encourage idol worship to their utmost, by
" keeping the knowledge of their Scriptures con-
" cealed from the rest of the people" [not exceed-ingly unlike the Roman Catholic Priests a little nearer home.—But this, by the way.]

Mrityoonjuya, a *Native* Pundit, treats the prac-tice as one of Modern Innovation; and his opinion and authorities will be found in the Parliamentary Papers.—Vol. 4. p. 11.

The Criminal Judge of Chittoor, [Fort St. George,] Mr. DACRE, says, under date 13th April, 1820: " The best informed and most respectable
" part of THE NATIVES would themselves have often
" prevented this ceremony, if they had had the
" power."—Vol. 2. p. 100.

In the Report of the Magistrate of Cuddapah to the Court of Circuit of Chittoor, dated 28th July, 1810, is recorded the case of a dying NATIVE, who requested his wife not to sacrifice herself on

his Pile, for the sake of their children, *which she obeyed.*—Vol. 2. p. 91.

I speak in the presence of Husbands and Fathers, and I put it to their consciences and feelings whether this is not a fact which ought to find its way to their hearts.

At Malabar, a Summary of the Laws of the Shaster was drawn up by THE NATIVES themselves, from which they actually conclude against the practice in the following terms:

"From these texts it is clear that the Rules re-
"lative to the observance of the Sacrifice of Anu
"gamanum [Suttee] does not extend to the Ke-
"roola, and cannot be admitted to be performed
"there, even if a person is willing to do so."

This Summary is recorded by Mr. HARRIS, the Magistrate of Mangalore, under date of 26th of August, 1819, and appears at length in Vol. 2. p. 127.

At Goa, it is not only recorded by Albuquerque's Son, (as has been mentioned before,) that his Father was highly extolled for the abolition of the Female Sacrifice; but it is also recorded by another Historian, that the Natives themselves so much revered his memory for this particular act of his Government, that they kept a lamp burning continually before his tomb, to preserve the constant remembrance of the benefit he had thus conferred on his Fellow-creatures.

A Civil Servant of the Company writes on this subject in addition: "Small Treatises have been

" put forth by enlightened Hindoos in Calcutta,
" calling upon their countrymen to renounce this
" horid superstition, proving that it was not sanc-
" tioned by, but repugnant to, the Vedas, and the
" doctrine of their most esteemed sages."

I would next refer to a Petition of the Hindoo Inhabitants of Calcutta, presented to the Marquis of Hastings, Governor General in Council, in the close of the year 1819; in consequence of an opinion that the Government then contemplated a more direct sanction of Human Sacrifices than it had yet expressed. The following Extracts will shew the sentiments of the best-informed Natives on the evils of their own corrupt system.

" That your Petitioners are fully aware from
" their own knowledge, or from the authority of
" credible eye-witnesses, that cases have frequently
" occurred where Women have been induced by
" the persuasions of their next heirs, interested in
" their destruction, to burn themselves on the fu-
" neral piles of their Husbands;—that others who
" have been induced, by fear, to retract a resolu-
" tion, rashly expressed in the first moments of
" grief, of burning with their deceased Husbands,
" have been forced upon the pile, and there bound
" down with ropes, and pressed by green bamboos,
" until consumed by the flames; and that some,
" after flying from the flames, have been carried
" back by their Relations, and burnt to death. All
" these instances your Petitioners humbly submit
" are Murders, according to every Shaster, as well
" as to the common sense of all nations.

" Your Petitioners further beg leave to state to " your Lordship, that Women have been permitted " to burn themselves on the Funeral Piles of men " who were not their Husbands; that Widows of " Brahmins have burnt themselves on a separate " pile; that Widows of the other castes have burnt " themselves many years after witnessing or learning " the death of their Husbands; that Girls of tender " years, Pregnant Women, and Women who have " been unfaithful to their Husbands, have burnt on " their Funeral Piles; and that the Mothers of Infant " children have, contrary to the dictates of nature " and morality, as well as of law, abandoned their " helpless and innocent offspring, to burn them- " selves with their deceased Husbands.

" Your Petitioners having been compelled, by " the motives already mentioned, to obtrude their " sentiments on this subject on your Lordship's " notice, beg leave further to submit to the bene- " volent attention of your Lordship's Government, " that in the opinion of many of the most learned " Brahmins, founded upon their Shasters, all " kinds of voluntary death are prohibited; that " Menu, whose authority is admitted to be equal " to that even of the Vedas, positively enjoins " widows to lead a life of virtue and abstinence " from sensual gratifications; that the Vedant, " which contains the essence of all the Vedas, as " well as the Geeta, forbid all acts done with the " view of future temporary reward; and that " amongst the inferior authorities, while some, as

" the Smiritee Shasters, actually prohibit all vio-
" lent death, others, Mitakshura, declare the lead-
" ing of a virtuous life preferable to dying on the
" pile of the husband; and a few only insist on
" the superior merit of concremation. . . . . .
" The Petitioners therefore, reflecting with plea-
" sure and gratitude on the means that have been
" adopted to prevent Mothers from sacrificing
" their children at Saugor, and likewise on the re-
" gulations in force against those barbarous Raj-
" poots who made it a rule of their caste to put
" their Female children to death, and also against
" the practice, formerly frequent, of putting a Rela-
" tion to death that the crime of the murder might
" fall on the head of an enemy, look with the most
" lively hope to *such further measures* relative to
" the custom of burning widows as may justly be
" expected from the known wisdom, decision, and
" humanity which have ever distinguished your
" Lordship's administration."

In concluding this head, I may perhaps be permitted to introduce the following Letter of an enlightened Native, which will probably be recognized by the Individual Proprietor to whom it was addressed in India, but whose name I shall, from motives of delicacy, omit to mention, although he deemed it his duty to oppose the Motion which was submitted to the Court. He will probably remember the observation of Boileau, in reference to any unnecessary designation of himself, " *Malheur à* " *ceux qui se feront connoître mal-a-propos.*"

" Most humane and benevolent Sir,

" It is with the strongest feelings of grief " and horror that I beg leave respectfully, in con- " formity to my promise, to acquaint you that " another most shocking and atrocious Suicide, " under the name of ' Suttee,' is about to be " perpetrated.

" The deluded victim is the Widow of a Hindoo, " named Motheir Shaw, who expired yesterday " afternoon at four o'clock. Being given to un- " derstand that the Brother of the deceased, Hur- " ree Motheir Shaw, having made an application " to the Magistrates of Calcutta, and obtained " sanction to put into execution this diabolical " vow, has resorted last night with the widow to " Coseepore, the place where this tragedy is fre- " quently held; but as it is an irresistible obliga- " tion on the inhuman beings (for so I must call " them) concerned in the Female Murders, to ob- " tain likewise the permission of the Magistrate " of the suburbs previously to their accomplishing " this most cruel and savage design, I am unable " to assure you whether it may take place to-day " or not, but still it might be ascertained by writing " to Mr. B——.

" Though I am perfectly sure that it would " shock your feelings to witness a scene of so dis- " gusting a nature as this, yet I suppose you may " wish to see the mode in which it is conducted. " If so, do me the favour of an answer per bearer, " that I may be in readiness to accompany you to

" the fatal spot, and also in the meantime to take " steps for procuring the requisite information from " Mr. B——. Should you receive for reply, that " it will take place to-day, I beg that you will be " condescendingly kind enough to send me one of " your Servants at my benevolent benefactor, Mr. " S's Office, when I will proceed with you to the " appointed place.

" I earnestly pray to the Almighty Merciful Fa- " ther, that he may extend his holy blessing to my " countrymen in general, by impressing on their " minds, the necessity of these notions, 'Relieve " the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for " the widow.'" Being in great haste, I conclude.

I have the honour to be,
With the greatest reverence,
Most humane and benevolent Sir,
Your most humble and very
Devoted servant,
HURREE HIER DATT.

Tuesday Morning, 7 o'Clock.

To ——— Esq.

It will not indeed form so much a matter of astonishment that the Natives of India should be desirous of ridding themselves from such a yoke, when it is remembered that some of the Heathens of an early period—I advert to the time antecedent to the introduction of Christianity itself—were enabled, by the mere light of nature, to discern the

evil of similar practices, and actually to abolish them without the aid of a Revelation from Heaven.

It is a very remarkable fact, that the Romans, (though Heathens themselves,) abolished Human Sacrifices in this country, at least a Century and an half, (but as is supposed, on the best authority, about two Centuries,) before the introduction of Christianity among us. The Romans conceived such an aversion to the Druids, the then High Priests of these abominations, whose inhumanities are minutely described by *Diodorus Siculus*, (Lib. 5.) that contrary to the ordinary policy observed by that people, in their conquests, of invariably tolerating the Religion of the country, they resolved upon an utter extirpation of these Priests and their cruelties.

It appears from Pliny, (L. 30. c. 1.) that Human Sacrifices were first forbidden at Rome, by a Decree of the Senate, A. U. C. 657, (when Lentulus and Crassus were Consuls,) but that some persons still continuing them privately, the Emperor Augustus renewed the prohibition with effect. The Emperor Tiberius then suppressed them in Gaul, and Claudius, as appears from Suetonius (In Claud. c. 25.) extirpated the Druids as well as their sanguinary worship, in that country. Those Sacrifices subsisted in our own country, (as appears from Pomponius Mela-*de situ orbis*—L. 3. c. 2.) until about the sixtieth year of the Christian æra, when the Roman General, *Paulinus Suetonius*, having reduced the Island of Anglesea, overthrew the Druids and their inhuman rites, so completely, that

they never afterwards revived; but all this was, as has been said, considerably anterior to the introduction of Christianity itself. And will it be endured that our own Heathen Conquerors shall have actually done more for us than we are willing to do for our Indian subjects?

Shall the mere natural principle of "Homo sum humani nihil a me alienum puto"—have exercised an influence on Idolatrous and Pagan Rome, and shall British England, acting under far higher sanctions, and obliged by a more powerful responsibility, refuse to acknowledge the force of the same argument?

Perhaps I should have noticed, earlier, the kindred evils of *Other sacrifices in India, in addition to the destruction of Women on the burning pile.*

[1.] Immolation of Children drowned in fulfilment of a vow prevails in different parts of India, as well as at Saugor, but particularly at an annual festival on the banks of the Brumhu-pootru, a river on the eastern borders of Bengal. In these cases, the Mother induces her child to venture beyond its depth, when she abandons it to perish. (Ward, Vol. 2. p. 122.) As these vows make a part of the popular superstition, there can be no doubt they are frequent in other parts of the country.

[2.] Immolations of victims under the Car of Juggernaut, in Orissa, which will be noticed more fully hereafter.

[3.] Immolations of the diseased and dying on the banks of the Ganges and other rivers deemed

sacred. Brought from home, in the scorching heat of the day, or the dews of the night, they are besmeared with the mud of the river, and the water of it is poured down their throats. The Relations always assist, and Mr. WARD mentions a painful case; while Mr. CAREY says, he witnessed at Catua, (70 miles north of Calcutta,) the burning of a Leper, as follows:—"A pit, about ten cubits deep was dug, "and a fire kindled at the bottom. The man, on "feeling the fire, begged to be taken out, and "struggled hard for that purpose. His Mother "and Sister, however, thrust him in again, and he "was cruelly burnt alive."

[4.] Immolation of persons in health by drowning.—A Captain in the military service, who resided at Allahabad for some time, says, he saw one morning, from his own window, (which commanded a view of the junction of the Jumna, and the Ganges,) 16 females drown themselves as a Religious rite, assisted by multitudes, as at the Suttees.

Dr. ROBINSON, of Calcutta, when residing at the same place, was informed of 11 persons who had just been drowned there, in a way of peculiar horror, which he describes.—In each case the victim was attended by Brahmins and others—12 were intended for destruction, but one escaped for protection to the Police station on the other side of the river, and was saved. The Brahmins followed him with sticks in a boat, resolved, if possible, not to lose their prey.

Well may another Resident, since at the same

Station, write as he does.—"Is there none to pity, "no arm to rescue these victims, daily casting "themselves into the Jumna?"

Although this place, from the junction of two rivers, is esteemed doubly sacred, the same abominations go on at every other sacred river, and are practised throughout the country.

[5.] The practice of burying the dead by the Jogees, or Tribe of Weavers, has been already noticed—the mode of which is, that a large grave is dug—the Widow sits in the centre, with the dead body on her knees, and encircled in her arms. The earth is thrown in by her own Children and other Relations, who press it down, as it rises, with their feet. She sees it ascend higher and higher, till she is suffocated by the accumulation, and perishes.

Of these Sacrifices, however, the most woeful is that of Juggernaut, and the following relation by an eye-witness of the most unimpeachable integrity,* which is not now before the Public for the first time, may here be quoted.—"The characteristics," says he, "of the worship, are Obscenity and Blood."

The description of the Obscenities are less to my purpose, and indeed unfit for the public ear—but I pass on to the Blood.

"The throne of the Idol was placed on a stupend-"ous Car or Tower, about 60 feet in height, rest-"ing on wheels which indented the ground deeply, "as they turned slowly under the ponderous ma-"chine. Attached to it were six cables of the size "and length of a ship's cable, by which the people

* Dr. Buchanan.

" drew it along. Thousands of Men, Women, and
" Children, pulled by each cable : Infants are made
" to exert their strength in this office, for it is ac-
" counted a merit of righteousness to move the
" God. Upon the Tower were the Priests and
" Satellites of the Idol, surrounding his throne.
" There were about 120 persons on the Car alto-
" gether. The Idol is a block of wood, having a
" frightful visage, painted black, with a distended
" mouth of a bloody colour. His arms are of gold,
" and he is dressed in gorgeous apparel. The
" other two Idols are of a white and yellow colour.
" Five Elephants preceded the three towers, bear-
" ing towering flags, dressed in crimson capari-
" sons, and having bells annexed to them."

" After the Tower had proceeded some way, a
" Pilgrim announced that he was ready to offer
" himself a sacrifice to the Idol. He laid himself
" down in the road before the Tower, as it was
" moving along, lying on his face, with his arms
" stretched forwards. The multitudes passed round
" him, leaving the space clear, and he was imme-
" diately crushed to death by the wheels of the
" Tower. A shout of joy was raised to the God.
" He is said to smile when the libation of the Blood
" is made! The people threw cowries, or small
" money, on the body of the victim in approbation
" of the deed. He was left to view, a consider-
" able time, and was then carried by the Hurries
" to the Golgotha, where I have just been view-
" ing his remains."

20th June, 1806.

"The horrid solemnities still continue. Yes-
"terday *a Woman* devoted herself to the Idol.
"She laid herself down on the road, in an oblique
"direction, so that the wheel did not kill her in-
"stantaneously, as is generally the case, but she
"died in a few hours. This morning, as I passed
"the place of skulls, nothing remained of her, but
"her bones."

21st June, 1806.

"The Idolatrous processions continue for some
"days longer, but my spirits are so exhausted
"by the constant view of these enormities, that
"I must hasten away. I beheld another distress-
"ing scene this morning. A poor Woman lying
"dead, or nearly dead, and her two Children by
"her, looking at the dogs and vultures which were
"near. The people passed by without noticing
"the Children. I asked them where was their
"home? They said, they had no home, but where
"their Mother was.—O there is no pity at Jug-
"gernaut—no mercy, no tenderness of heart, in
"Moloch's kingdom."

Juggernaut's Temple, near Ishera, on the Ganges.

May, 1807.

"The Tower here is drawn along, like that of
"Juggernaut, by cables. The number of wor-
"shippers at this festival is computed to be about
"a hundred thousand. The tower is covered with
"indecent emblems freshly painted for the occa-

"sion, which were the objects of sensual gaze by "both sexes. One of the victims of this year was "a well made young man of healthy appearance "and comely aspect. He had a garland of flowers "round his neck, and his long black hair was "dishevelled. He danced for awhile before "the Idol, singing in an *enthusiastic strain*." This, I observe, is Enthusiasm, the desire to stop it, is not—however it may be so branded, here, or elsewhere—"and then rushing suddenly to the "wheels, he shed his blood under the Tower of "Obscenity."

"About the year 1790, no fewer than Twenty-"eight Hindoos were crushed to death at this very "place, Ishera, under the Wheels of Juggernaut. "The fact of their deaths was notorious, and was "recorded in the Calcutta Newspapers of the "period."

At this Temple, the Government levy a tax on Pilgrims, and pay out of it the expences of the Idol! The annual expences of the Idol, as presented to the English Government, and extracted from the official accounts were, in one year, as under:

	Rupees.	or Sterling.
1. Expences attending the Table of the Idol	36,115	— £4,514
2. Ditto of his Dress or Wearing Apparel	2,712	— 339
3. Ditto of the Wages of his Servants . .	10,057	— 1,259
4. Ditto of Contingent Expences at the different seasons of Pilgrimage	10,989	— 1,373
5. Ditto of his Elephants and Horses . .	3,030	— 378
6. Ditto of his Rutt or Annual State Carriage	6,713	— 839
Rupees	69,616	£8,702

In the 3d Item, "*the wages of his Servants,*" are included the wages of the Prostitutes who are kept for the obscene rites of the Temple.*

The State Carriage in Item 6, is the Car. Mr.

* An Honorable Proprietor before alluded to, [Mr. Trant] observed, in the Debate—upon the authority of Colonel Phipps—that the emblems of the Temple were afterwards removed, and that Pilgrims were no longer enticed to destroy themselves. On referring to the Colonel himself, as well as to his interesting Public Statement, contained in the Church Missionary Register for December, 1824, I find that so far as the OUTER walls of the Temple only are concerned, the abominable Indecencies there exhibited have (in necessary deference to the Government which collects a Tax from such a source) been removed, but that the Internal sculptures remain as before; and that the interior pollutions of this Heathen Temple still continue to partake of their former undisputed character of bloodshed and profligacy, to the same extent as ever. I find also, that there is reason to believe that the Sacrifices performed under the wheels of the Car do not now continue, although of this there is no decided evidence; but there is no reason to suppose that the Sacrifice of human victims has diminished in the interior of the Temple; while the immense consumption of human life which invariably takes place, every year, at the great Festival (owing to the enormous resort of Pilgrims to this spot, and to the Famine always produced in consequence) remains the same. It was not attempted to be denied, in this discussion, that the British Government, not merely tolerates, and sanctions, so much Idolatry and Crime, but derives an immense Revenue from this polluted source. The Gentleman who noticed these external amendments which, after all, are mere tributes to common decency, and humanity (though highly important, as far as they go,) has only thought proper to produce as much of the awful and appalling account given by Colonel Phipps as was necessary to his own object, but he has entirely passed over every thing in that Relation which proves the Idolatry of Juggernaut to be most destructive to the Indian population, in its consequences upon Human Life, and most disgraceful to the British Government, in its continuance as a source of public Revenue.

If any one desires to gain a complete view of this whole subject,

Hunter stated the cost of the English cloth with which the three Cars were decorated, in June 1806, to be upwards of £200. sterling.

The Province of Orissa, in which Juggernaut is situated, first became subject to British empire, under the administration of Marquis Wellesley. It was proposed to his Lordship, shortly after, to pass the regulation for the management of the Temple and levying the tax, to which he objected, and left the Government without sanctioning it. When discussed by the succeeding Government, Mr. Udny (who had before joined Lord Wellesley in refusing to sanction the Prohibitory Regulations as to the practice of the Suttees in 1805) considered this such a violation of propriety and decency, as to record his solemn dissent to it, as one of the Members of the Supreme Council, for transmission to England. The other Members of Council, however, considered Juggernaut to be a legitimate source of revenue, on the principle that money for other Heathen Temples had long been brought into the public treasury.

One estimate I have seen (which was supplied me from an authentic source), of the tax upon the worshippers of this bloody and obscene Idol for the year 1822—3, makes it amount to two lacs and 35,000 rupees, or above £29,000 sterling, which, though oppressive in the highest degree, and

he will do well to refer to the Public Statement given by the Colonel, to which I have before adverted, where he will find abundant proof that the continuance of this national opprobrium is referable to THE BOARD OF CONTROUL FOR INDIA, rather than to the Court of Directors of the East India Company.

affecting in one Festival at least 200,000 persons, excites no murmur among the Hindoos, who simply infer that the British are convinced of the divinity of Juggernaut. The ready acquiescence of the people in this taxation of their Religion is no mean proof that its bloodshed might be stopped.*

It further appears from documents before Parliament, that the Indian Government were not afraid on one occasion to seize the car of Juggernaut, and the Idol itself, for the payment of a deficient tribute, from which, however, no ill consequences ensued, and shall we be more tender of our tottering Revenue, than of the Lives of our perishing population?

A pecuniary tax is also levied upon the Pilgrims resorting to bathe in the sacred waters of Allahabad. This is an equal interference of Political power with a Religious rite, but the quiet acquiescence in its imposition, affords no insufficient answer to those who contend that Religious prejudice is to be untouched—while, at the same time, it raises another, but not less serious question, how far any Christian Government can be justified in deriving a Revenue from such an unhallowed source: on which, we need hardly go farther than our own Shakespeare:

"There is no sure foundation set in blood."

In addition to which, a great authority has said—

* Having been since enabled to present a Statement for no fewer than Thirteen years (viz. from 1812-13 to 1824-25 inclusive) of the Receipts and Expences of the Temple at Juggernaut, *on the correctness of which the fullest dependance may be placed*, I have subjoined it in an Appendix [No. 2.]

". Whatever is morally wrong, can never be politically right"—

And no less a man than Mr. BURKE declares, that " Whatever disunites man from God, disunites man from man."

I am well aware that notwithstanding the Rites of Juggernaut are thus sanguinary, it has been said that they are not precisely analogous to the burnings of the Hindoo Widows, as partaking more of the character of simple Religious Suicides, in which, so far as yet appears, no particular force, or even persuasion, are employed; but the object of the Motion now before the Court, is, to throw the ample shield of British protection quite as much over every deluded victim who may cast away Life as a voluntary Sacrifice, as over those who may be sacrificed either by force, or fraud: Wherever innocuous ceremonies terminate, and blood becomes necessary to the propitiation of " them that are no Gods"—there the Motion I have had the honor to submit, will come into action; its broad principle being, that " in the case of all Rites *involving the* " *destruction of life*, it is the duty of a Paternal " Government to interpose for their prevention;" precisely as it is the duty of a Parent to save a *foolish* child from death, whenever it is in his power, as well as a *wise* one. Now God, in his Providence, having armed the British Government with the power of saving life in India, the point for which I contend is, that the Government has a better right to exercise that power, than the victim of superstition has to resist it; and that it is a

greater duty in the Government to preserve its own subjects from destruction, than to suffer them to perish. I contend that the wretched victim of a sanguinary delusion has no more right over his own life, on the score of Religion, than he has a right over the lives of his fellow creatures, upon no better pretext: and that, therefore, the Government which consents to look on, while these deeds of darkness are doing, is in the eye of God and man, a partaker of the guilt of blood.

It has been said out of doors, and may possibly be argued here, that our interference cannot take place without exciting Rebellion, because the Massacre at Vellore took place in consequence of interference with the Religious prejudices of the people.

As this is a subject upon which much misconception prevails, it is the more necessary to examine it distinctly; and believing, as I do, that the fullest examination which the objection can receive, will be entirely favourable to the cause I advocate, I have chosen to meet it at once, by way of anticipation, rather than to wait for an attack which there may possibly be no opportunity of answering by a regular reply.

Now it fortunately so happens, that if there be one objection less founded upon real fact than another, it is that objection which arises out of a supposition that the mutiny at Vellore was in any degree the result of a religious feeling on the part of the Native Troops, or any invasion of their religious opinions or prejudices by their European Commanders.

We have the highest authority, that of the Governor of Madras himself, confirmed also by the deliberate judgment of the Court of Directors, pronounced, after a full investigation of the whole affair, in their Official Letter to the Government abroad, dated 29th May 1807—for concluding that —I quote the Director's own words—"the imme-"diate cause of discontent among the Sepoys was "the introduction of certain innovations in their "Dress which were offensive, and, as they held, "degrading to them; and the Captive Sons of the "late TIPPOO SULTAN, with their adherents and "abettors, took occasion from this dissatisfaction to "instigate them to insurrection and revolt, with the "view of effecting their own liberation, and the "restoration of the Mahomedan power in that quar-"ter." Such is the short, but authentic, account of this matter, from the best authority. But if this affair at Vellore is to be quoted as a reason against interference now, I ask how the cases are allied? Is the unnecessary provocation of men, with arms in their hands, by the invasion of their personal privileges, or, if you will, of their Religious prejudices, to be put in competition with the preservation of the lives of their own Country Women, and the prevention of so much unnecessary bloodshed? Is the righteous protection of defenceless Widows and Orphans to be put upon the footing of unjust insults offered to an Army? Until it can be shewn that these cases are analagous, it is to be hoped that the Mutiny at Vellore will not be quoted as a reason aainst the adoption of this Motion.

This is an argument (the argumentum in terrorem, never yet forgotten by any good logician,) to which, I am deeply grieved to say, even Lord Amherst has not hesitated to lend the weight of his public name and influence. In his Letter to the Court of Directors of the 3d Dec. 1824, he observes: "The point which appears to be of "more importance and delicacy than any other in- "volved in the whole question, viz. the probable "effect of any prohibitory measures on the feeling "of the Native Army, has not hitherto been touch- "ed upon at all in any of the opinions which have "been submitted to Government." This is an authority, from the pressure of which, I have no desire to shrink. I conceive it capable of a ready answer. The Judges, Magistrates, Collectors, Civil and Military Officers, and others who have reported so numerously and decidedly on the perfect ease and practicability of Abolition, have never, for a moment, dreamt of such a case as barely possible, as the Native Army rising against the prevention of Murder. It was impossible that all these Witnesses should have overlooked the supposed difficulty—they were living in the midst of these scenes, and must have become the first sacrifices of the native Soldiery, had their recommendation produced any fatal results. All this, they could not but know. The several Governor Generals, and Courts of Nizamut Adawlut, who have, in succession, equally declared that the time for Abolition must arrive, though they did not think it had yet come; all these well knew when they

declared past measures of expediency wholly inefficient, and the future remedy of Abolition wholly essential;—all well knew that there was, and must continue to be, a Native Army to resent this interference; and it was only because they rejected, as impossible, the notion that the Native Army would insist on retaining the privilege of burning miserable women alive, and would mutiny and rebel if they were deprived of so high a privilege, that they did not touch upon it. They could not honour with their notice a fear which they had never felt, nor erect a speculation into importance which had never entered into their heads. If there had been really any thing to fear from the Army, the future abolition of the practice never could have been contemplated by them at all, for the reasons already suggested; and consequently the Abolition would be rendered hopeless for ever. Will Lord Amherst inform us in what single instance the Native Army has ever disgraced itself by any demonstration of discontent, upon such grounds, from the Execution of the Brahmin Nundcomar, above half a century since, down to the last half yearly prevention of the sacrifice of Infants at Saugur? yet in the latter case, in particular, the Native Sepoys are themselves the military force which saves the Children from being thrown to the sharks, and humanely prevents their own Mothers from becoming their murderers. Never, Sir, will I consent, for one, to suspect such evil as this, of the Native Troops of India, nor ever hesitate, when the opportunity is afforded, of bearing my humble testimony to the

value of those men, whose patience under priyations, and whose valour in the field, have so long been the theme of universal commendation.

What! was the case once supposed of ten thousand swords leaping from their scabbards to avenge even a look that threatened one Female with insult? and shall a case so opposite be now supposed, as that of a whole Army being at once wicked, and weak enough, to revolt from their allegiance, because the Females of their own blood, their own Mothers, Wives, and Sisters, are to be denied the privilege of being burnt alive? The very supposition of such an event is too monstrous to require any serious comment, and only needs to be stated, in order to its complete refutation.

It is no longer any secret to this Court, that *the Directors themselves have been divided in opinion upon the practicability of the suppression of this evil.* The knowledge of this fact happened to come to my notice, in the first instance, from the information of one of those Directors who had presented a voluminous statement to his own Court upon the subject of this evil. On applying to the Chairman for a sight of this Document, I was informed that only a General Court had the power to direct its production. On applying at the succeeding General Court, which took place a single week before the Motion, it was held by the Directors that only a *Notice* of Motion could be admitted at that Court. On my representing to the Court, that this must necessarily preclude the possibility of consulting the Document at all, the

Chairman consented that it should be laid upon the table on the day of this discussion; but another Director * then declaring that, even if it were placed there, it could only be referred to upon a distinct Resolution being first carried at the General Court, declaring that it might be read, I, of course, from that moment, relinquished all hope of being able to inspect it. Of this circumstance, I make no complaints, but shall only express my regret—a regret in which the Directors themselves will no doubt partake, that they should be so shackled by forms, as to refuse any Proprietor (who is known to have given public notice of an intention to move on any given subject) the sight of a Document which he considers both essential to his Argument, and to the proper information of his Brother Proprietors; I must consider it matter of regret that any Court should thus feel itself bound, hand and foot, by technical subtleties unfriendly to the advancement of truth, and that it should not, upon particular occasions, be enabled to exercise a more liberal discretion; and I express this regret upon the principle of "Summum jus summa injuria," or, as Mr. Pope has happily conveyed the same idea:

"A right too rigid, hardens into wrong."

In consequence, however, of having been thus precluded from examining this Protest of the late Directors, all that is left me for the purpose of my argument is the naked fact, that while Seventeen of the Directors have affixed their signatures to an

* Mr. Wigram.

Official Act on the subject in question, as late as the year 1823, Two of that Body have since solemnly protested, under their hands, in an unequivocal way, against the continuance of this abominable practice.*

It may perhaps be asked, *Why has not Parliament deemed it fit to act upon the information for which it has called?* If this question is meant to imply, that Parliament is silent because of the difficulty of interference, and that therefore the Proprietors of East India Stock ought to be silent too; I apprehend that such a conclusion is altogether founded in error. The probability is, that Parliament may prefer that any change in the present system should originate with ourselves as the more legitimate source of Oriental Government; and that it is only in the event of our deserting an obvious duty, that the Parliament properly could, or is likely to desire to, interpose; but is it creditable to the Company to wait for an interference which, if it should become necessary to exert it at all, is far less likely to be administered with tenderness, and under a full knowledge of the peculiar exigencies and difficulties of the case, than if we shall determine to reform ourselves?

I believe that I yield to no one here, in the respect which I unfeignedly entertain for the highest Court of Legislature and Appeal known to the Country; but it is from no disrespect to the functions or authority of Parliament, that I would hesi-

* The Two Directors thus protesting, were MR. HUDLESTON and MR. MONEY.

tate to invite its interference, in a case where the East India Company itself appears every way better qualified to devise, and administer, the necessary remedy. But farther—What real friend of the Company, or of its interests, would desire to deprive us of the grace of doing a spontaneous act of benignity and mercy? If we have erred by our past remissness, our only reparation to suffering humanity is honestly to acknowledge it, and by retracing our steps, to prove to the world that we believe it no degradation to confess that we are wiser to day than we were yesterday. Perhaps, however, a better reason for the Parliament not having acted earlier, may be, that it did not consider the time for action to have fully arrived before. In the unquiet condition of our affairs in India, perhaps even as late as the preceding year, many persons might have felt doubts of the expediency of acting; and we have seen how this consideration affected the pure mind of Mr. HARINGTON, even after he had put upon record the strongest and most decided opinion in favour of unconditional Abolition, which it was possible for him to register. But it is our fortune to have fallen upon other and better times. The storms of hostility have subsided into a calm. The dove bears the olive branch again, and the bow appears in the cloud.

There is a single Argument which, as I know it to have weight with some, I am unwilling to pass over in silence—which is that *If Sacrifices were even abolished in public, they would still be carried on in private.* This Argument appears to me

to prove too much—as it would equally affect (if admitted) the prohibition of any other Murder, or of any minor crime, all which, in spite of the wisest laws, *may* be equally performed in private—but even supposing that such a consequence should follow, which is to suppose the worst possible result, and the least probable one—at all events, the evil would then have had the solemn denunciation of Authority against it, and not the sanction of either its direct or implied encouragement. "Utcunque ceciderit; "hoc restabit solatii, tuam negligentiam haud de- "traxisse malum." Is there not an obvious distinction to be taken between the virtual authorization of scenes, at which human nature itself revolts, and that just and righteous reprobation of them, which even if it were to fail, at first, of effecting its object, must drive them at once into holes, and corners, and brand them with their proper name of Murder, until they shall be eventually driven beyond the pale of Society. At all events, our responsibility is clear, and of this we are bound to rid ourselves, whatever may be the result; since it is a part of the common law of England, which has the highest reason for its basis—that "Qui "non prohibet cum prohibere possit, jubet."—

"Men must pursue things," (says Lord Bacon,) "which are just in present, and leave the future "to the Divine Providence."—[*Advancement of Learning.*]

Another Argument which may be urged for delay is that *The Authorities in India are most competent to legislate upon it, and therefore it should be*

left to their discretion. To this, the Parliament of the country has supplied me with an abundant answer in the Printed Papers. From these it is proved, that from the very origin of our empire in India, the toleration of bloodshed, in every form, and to an immense extent, has gone on, not only under the abused name of Religion, but with the tacit encouragement of the Indian Government that such a system of crime has been aggravated, rather than repressed by the adoption of the Prohibitory Regulations, which have been invariably interpreted as affording the direct sanction and concurrence of the Indian Government in such abominations—and that in spite of all the experience arising from such a source, we are assured by Lord Amherst, the present Governor General, as late as in the last month of 1824—that we are no nearer the end of all this iniquity than ever. Can we need any better evidence of the unwillingness, or indecision, of the Indian Government, to rid itself, and the Parent State, of such a reproach, than these recorded facts?

In confirmation of the Evidence thus supplied, I may refer to a Letter of a Correspondent before mentioned, who has been for some time a Civil Officer of the Company. "So long," (says he,) "as "this practice does not interfere with the punctual "collection of the Revenue, nor with the regular "administration of Justice, there is little probabi- "lity of its attracting the degree of attention ne- "cessary to its suppression. The Indian Govern-

"ments have been ready enough to remove all "Native prejudices, however sanctioned by Reli- "gion, when injurious to these great objects; but "it is now an ascertained fact, that they have only "paid attention to this particular subject, as moved "by the Authorities in England, and in what man- "ner they have obeyed that call, will best appear "from their Official Returns."

Another reason for delay is—an opinion that *We should wait until the influence of Christianity, by gradually enlightening the people to see the evil of the custom, may effect its abolition.*

To the force of this observation, I wish for one to allow its full weight, but—not to observe that it comes, when urged in the shape of an objection, with an ill grace from those who evince an undue alarm at every step which is taken towards the conversion of the Natives to Christianity—it has been my object to keep out of the present discussion, as much as possible, all reference to the principles of our common Christianity—not because I am by any means insensible to the infinite value of a system to which I confess myself indebted for all that can render Life desirable, administer sure consolation in Death, or supply any well-grounded hope for Eternity; but because I have thought it wholly unnecessary to my particular Argument (which has simply for its object the extinction of Human Sacrifices) to introduce the higher sanctions and prohibitions of Revealed Religion: as apprehending that although the mere light of unassisted Nature

may not, of itself, have power to keep Idolaters from such Sanguinary Rites, as, in point of fact, we know it never has had, in India, or elsewhere, in the absence of higher motives; yet that the acknowledged influence of such evils upon Human Society, and their pernicious and destructive consequences, under any form of Government, will abundantly justify the ruling power, whether Infidel or Christian, in suppressing them; and this upon the common principles of Humanity, and independently of all arguments for their extirpation which may be derived from a higher and purer source. It is under a conviction that it would not be necessary to occupy the higher ground of a Revelation from Heaven, in combating such a palpable corruption as the shedding of human blood under pretext of Religion, that I have chosen to take an inferior position. Others, every way better qualified, may demonstrate, here or elsewhere, the duties which devolve on us as Christians, and to them I resign that important branch of the subject. In waiting, however, for so important a period as the universal instruction of our Native Population in the truths of Christianity, it must be evident to the most sanguine calculator, that a very considerable time must necessarily elapse. It is, however, quite unreasonable, and would be highly criminal, that with no better evidence of its utility, we should for an instant contemplate the continuance of the present system, through the many years which are yet, in all probability, to intervene between the

present moment, and the general diffusion of Christianity in the East.

I shall beg to close this particular remark with another reference to the Letter of a Correspondent, a Civil Officer of the Company who has possessed the best opportunities of observation in India.

"The prospect" (he observes) "of Christianity "enlightening the people to see the evil of the "practice, is remote indeed, while the selfish pas- "sions of a corrupt Priesthood are engaged in "upholding it. The Brahmin Officiators, who "are essential to the ceremony, always receive "large gratuities upon these occasions, amounting "sometimes to between 40*l.* and 50*l.* which, at the "rate of subsistence in India, is fully equal to indi- "vidual maintenance for as many months. These "men will not relinquish their gains, if left to "themselves, so long as Hindooism continues to be "the Religion of India, for it is only with the ex- "tinction of the National creed, that the influence "of the Brahmins can terminate. It is idle, there- "fore, to expect amelioration under any other "state of things than a general conversion to "Christianity—an event, which, however, im- "portant in itself, appears at too great a distance "to satisfy the just expectations of the friends of "humanity, or to prevent their efforts for an earlier "change."

It was my intention, Sir, to have troubled the Court with several Authorities of the enlightened and humane, upon the evil of the system we deplore,

and the necessity of supplying an adequate remedy. The time, however, to which these remarks have been extended, will prevent my doing more than making a single Extract from the invaluable Tract upon India and our relations with it, written in 1797, by Mr. CHARLES GRANT, (the late Director,) and printed by the House of Commons in 1813, a Treatise of the highest character, and one which I could wish were far better known both to the East India Company, and to the Country at large—being a document, in all its parts, the most various, profound, and polished, which has, perhaps, ever appeared on the subject, within the same compass.

"Are we bound for ever to preserve all the "enormities in the Hindoo system? Have we "become the guardians of every monstrous prin- "ciple and practice which it contains? Are we "pledged to support, for all generations, by the "authority of our Government, and the power of "our arms, the miseries which Ignorance and "Knavery have so long entailed upon a large por- "tion of the human race? Is this the part which "a free, a humane, and an enlightened Nation, has "engaged to act towards its own subjects? It "would be too absurd and extravagant to main- "tain, that any engagement of this kind exists; "that Great Britain is under any obligation direct "or implied, to uphold errors and usages gross "and fundamental, subversive of the first prin- "ciples of Reason, Morality, and Religon.

"If we had conquered such a kingdom as "Mexico, where a number of human victims were "regularly offered every year upon the Altar of the "Sun, should we have calmly acquiesced in this "horrid mode of butchery? Yet for Thirty years," (now Sixty) "we have with perfect unconcern, seen "Rites, in reality more cruel and atrocious, prac-"tised in our Indian Territories. If human life "must be sacrificed to Superstition, at least the "more useless, worthless, or unconnected members "of Society might be devoted. But in Hindostan, "Mothers of families are taken from the midst of "their Children, who have just lost their Father "also, and, by a most diabolical complication of "force and fraud, are driven into the flames.*

"In considering the affairs of the world as under "the controul of the Supreme Disposer, and those "distant Territories as, by strange events, provi-"dentially placed in our hands, is it not reason-"able, is it not necessary, to conclude that they "were given to us, not merely that we might draw "an annual profit from them, but that we might "diffuse among their Inhabitants, long sunk in "darkness, vice and misery, the benign light and "influences of Truth, and the blessings of well-"ordered Society? And that, in prudently and "sincerely endeavouring to answer these ends, we "may not only hope for some measure of the same

* "Murder most foul, as in the best it is;
"But this, most foul, strange, and unnatural."
SHAKSPEARE.

"success which has usually attended all serious "and rational attempts for the propagation of that "pure and sublime Religion which comes from "God, but best secure the protection of His provi- "dential Government, of which we now see such "awful marks in the events of the world."

I have now, Sir, as a Proprietor of East India Stock, humbly endeavoured to discharge my duty to the Company, and the Country, by attempting to remove from us the reproach of so much innocent blood; and I have only to call upon my Brother Proprietors to do their parts, in examining the facts with which the British Parliament has furnished them. I call upon the Court of Proprietors to exercise its own honest and honourable judgment without being disposed to surrender that judgment, too implicitly to the guidance of others. I conjure them not to suffer themselves to be alarmed, unnecessarily, by distant contingencies of unexplained, and unproved evil, but to remember that

"Our doubts are Traitors,
"And make us lose the good we oft might win,
"By fearing to attempt."

Let no Man fear that in standing between the living and the dead, and staying this plague, he shall ever array against himself either the Civil or Military force of any Nation under Heaven.

In reference to alarms of this description, as unworthy of the Native Population of India, as of ourselves, I would refer to a Periodical Publication

better known in India than in this Country, but to the merits of which work, I find the following testimony, in the Parliamentary Papers, from no less a man than Mr. HARINGTON, who says that SIR HENRY BLOSSETT, the late Judge, and himself, both considered this "a powerful and convincing statement of the real facts and circumstances of the case."—[Vol. 4, p. 20.]

"'Let us then freely look at the practicability of "its Abolition, and number both its friends, and "its foes. We may calculate on the support of "all the humane, the wise and the good, throughout "India: we may depend on that great majority of "the people who have prevented every village in "India from being lighted up monthly with these "infernal fires. Those who used all their power "and influence to liberate their country from the "stigma of this guilt, by preventing their own "Mothers and Sisters from ascending the funeral "pile, will undoubtedly support us in discoun-"tenancing the practice elsewhere. We shall en-"list on our side all those tender feelings, which, "though now dormant, will then be aroused into "new life and vigour, but above all, we shall sur-"round ourselves with the protection of that Al-"mighty power whose command is, "Thou shalt "do no Murder"—who defends the weak, and suc-"cours the injured; who, when the cries of op-"pressed India had pierced his ear, selected us of "all other Nations to break its chains, and restore it "to happiness. With all these advantages in our

"favour, we may surely despise the complaints of "those, who, despicable in numbers, have rendered "themselves still more despicable by their inhu- "manity; to whom the shrieks of a Mother or "a Sister, writhing in the flames, are as the sweet- "est music; who have parted with all that distin- "guishes Men from Demons, and retain nothing of "our Nature, but its outward form."—Friend of India, Vol. 4, p. 26.

It is impossible for me to know, with certainty, in what manner the Court of Directors intend to meet this Motion, and I am therefore bound, in charity, to suppose they will offer no opposition to it, either by an Amendment, or any other means. If however I should be mistaken in this supposition, I must then ask them, in the face of the Proprietors, and of the Country, with what colour of justice or decency, they can resist a Motion couched in the temperate and cautious terms in which this presents itself—a Motion which abstains from all attempts at dictation, and seeks to carry nothing by precipitance—which asks the Directors themselves to effect an object acknowledged on all hands to be desirable, in their own time, and in their own way; under the distinct recognition, however, that it is the positive duty of the Parent Government to interpose, and to prevent the continuance of Human Sacrifices in India—a duty which I contend has never to this hour been formally acknowledged either by the Government at home or abroad—not assuredly by the Court

of Directors in their Letter of the 17th June, 1823—still less by the Governor General of India in his answer of the 3rd December, 1824—and never, in any shape, by the Proprietors of East India Stock.

If it be contended that the public recognition of this duty is no more than the assertion of a truism, I answer that the value of its recognition is, that it cannot be so acknowledged in the face of the world without involving us all, in the responsibility of acting upon the admission, sooner or later, and in one way or another; and it is therefore I feel anxious that it should be put upon record, and that we may resolve to place ourselves under such obligations as we have never yet contracted to our Indian subjects, or to each other.

While, however, there is nothing in this Motion to prevent the most temperate and cautious movements on the part of our Oriental Government, both at home and abroad, I do not wish to disguise from the Court, that the eventual object and intent of the Motion is unconditional and uncompromising Abolition; because I feel assured that nothing short of this, will either relieve the People of India, or satisfy the people of England.

I conjure the Court, in this particular, to

> "Lay no flattering unction to their souls,
> "Which will but skin and film the ulcerous part,
> "While rank corruption mining all within,
> "Infects unseen."

Of such a nature has been the hope of advantage,

conceived at first, and cherished only too long, from the Prohibitory Regulations, which I trust have been abundantly proved to have been "weighed in the balance, and found wanting."

Again I would say—Beware lest a ruder hand than mine, drive you to extremities. I venture to call myself the friend of the Company, because I can, happily, appeal to a connection with it of about Thirty years' standing, and can challenge its Conductors to point out a single instance, during that time, in which I have ever appeared in any other character. It is, then, in that relation, that I would say to the Court of Directors—Reject not honest and disinterested counsel. Believe that interests of the first importance are depending upon the course which you may choose to adopt. You stand at present upon the brink of a precipice, but have yet time to recede. All England awaits the decision of this day, with intense interest—an interest which is only exceeded by the breathless anxiety with which India, bleeding at every pore, invokes your aid—I beseech you to suffer no sordid hope of preserving even Empire itself, at THE PRICE OF BLOOD, to deter you from an act of the most substantial equity.—

"BE JUST, and FEAR NOT,
"Let all the ends thou aims't at be thy Country's,
"Thy God's, and Truth's."

APPENDIX—No. 1.

Copy of a Letter from the Court of Directors to the Governor General in Council, at Fort William, in Bengal, dated 17th June, 1823:—

"We have had before us your proceedings, with "the various documents recorded and referred to in "your consultations of the 30th July, 1819, rela- "ting to Suttees. You are aware that the attention "of Parliament and the Public has lately been "called to this subject. We are disposed to give "you a large discretion in regard to the pre- "vention of Suttees, because we are persuaded "that no general rule can be laid down with either "safety or efficiency, and that the adaptation of "particular measures to local peculiarities can only "be effected by the Indian Governments.

"After an attentive consideration of all that has "been lately received from the several Presidencies "on this subject, and the very various opinions "concerning Suttees, which have been received "from the public Officers, it appears that the prac- "tice varies very much in different parts of India, "both as to the extent to which it prevails, and the enthusiasm by which it is upheld. The necessity,

" therefore, as well as the policy and probable effect " of strong measures of repression, must *vary with* " *the varying circumstances of the district.*

" The line of distinction which you have drawn " in the Circular orders of 1817, between the differ- " ent cases of Suttee, proceeds upon a more gene- " ral principle.

" It is undoubtedly the policy of our Government " to *abstain from interference with the religious* " *opinions and prejudices of the natives;* and it is, " therefore, upon an intelligible ground that you " have adopted the rule which permits the sacrifice, " when it is clearly voluntary, and conformable to " the Hindoo religion, and authoritatively prevents " it in all other cases."

" To us however it appears very doubtful (and " we are confirmed in this doubt by respectable au- " thority) whether the measures which have been " already taken, in pursuance of this principle, " have not tended rather to increase than to diminish " the frequency of the practice. Such a tendency " is, at least, not unnaturally ascribed to a regula- " tion which, prohibiting a practice only in certain " cases, appears to sanction it in all others. And it " is to be apprehended, that where the people have " not previously a very enthusiastic attachment to " the custom, a law, which shall explain to them the " cases in which it ought not to be followed, " may be taken as a direction for adopting it in all " others. Indeed in a district wherein the prac- " tice, if ever known, has fallen into disuse, any

" public mention of it whatever would appear im-
" politic, although it would be highly desirable to
" resist any attempt to revive it.

" It is, moreover, with much reluctance tha twe
" can consent to make the British Government, by
" a specific permission of the Suttee, an ostensible
" party to the Sacrifice; we are averse also to the
" practice of making British Courts expounders and
" vindicators of the Hindoo Religion, when it leads
" to acts which, not less as Legislators than as
" Christians, we abominate."

" This reasoning we will at present push no far-
" ther than to ENJOIN you, for this, as well as for
" other considerations, TO INTERFERE AS LITTLE
" AS POSSIBLE.* We will not forbid you to act
" upon the Regulation to which we have referred, if
" you really find that its application diminishes the
" evil. We wish, however, that neither this plan
" of discriminating and qualified permission, nor
" *any plan of repression, should be positively and*
" *generally prescribed to the Magistrates*; there
" should in no case be more than a Licence, to be
" used *according to the discretion of those who*
" *are acquainted with local circumstances.* In a
" matter so delicate, the same Regulation may be
safe and wise, or dangerous and impolitic, accord-

* In the Answer of LORD AMHERST and his Council to this Letter, dated 3rd December, 1824, it is observed—" The whole " course of our proceedings has been, in conformity with the " principle enjoined by your Honorable Court, *to interfere as* " *little as possible!*"

" ing to the character of the Officer by whom it is to
" be executed. We know of instances in which a
" Magistrate, having acquired by praiseworthy me-
" thods an influence among the Natives, has been
" readily obeyed in a positive prohibition of the sa-
" crifice of a Widow. It may be true, that where
" this occurred, the prejudice was not deeply rooted,
" but still, much was unquestionably owing to the ju-
" dicious conduct and experience of the Magistrate,
" and an attempt to imitate him by a person not
" possessing the same qualifications, might be more
" than unsuccessful.

" Instances of this nature, therefore, would not
" warrant us to authorize *a general prohibition;*
" but connected with the opinions expressed by
" many intelligent men that the practice of Suttee is
" not a tenet of Religion to which the people are en-
" thusiastically attached, but rather an abuse, fost-
" ered by interested Priests or Relations, these
" instances of partial success do lead us to regard
" the notion of prohibition, *modified according to*
" *circumstances,* of this barbarous custom, with
" *rather less of apprehension* than it has generally
" produced. We say this without hesitation,
" *because we are not at all afraid that you will*
" *act imprudently upon our declaration.* You
" will take it, as it is meant, for an encouragement
" to you seriously to consider the subject, and an
" assurance of our disposition to co-operate in such
" measures as *your superior means of estimating*
" *consequences* may suggest to you. Assuredly,

" the most acceptable form of success would be,
" that which would be brought about by such an
" increase of intelligence among the people as
" should show them the wickedness and absurdity
" of the practice; next to this, we should rejoice
" to see the Abolition effected by influence, and
" the co-operation of the higher order of Natives.

" It is hardly necessary to add, that measures
" for protecting the females from violence, and
" punishing those who administer intoxicating
" drugs, will have our approbation.

" We are,

" Yours, &c."

[Signed by Seventeen of the Directors.]

London, 17th June, 1823.

No. II.

Annual Amount of the Tax on Pilgrims attending the Temple of Juggernaut, with the Amount of the Annual Expences, from 1812-13 *to* 1824-25 *(estimating the value of the Rupee, as before, at* 2s. 6d. *English.)*

Year.	Amount of Tax collected.	Collector and Establishment.	Expences of Temple.	Buildings, Repairs, and Contingencies.	Total Charges.	Net Receipts.	Surplus Expenditure.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
1812-13	6381 2 6	2011 10 0	5825 17 6	850 10 0	8687 17 6	.....	2306 15 0
1813-14	10,895 0 0	2011 10 0	5522 7 6	425 5 0	7969 2 6	2925 17 6	.....
1814-15	26,065 0 0	2877 7 6	5979 0 0	845 7 6	9701 15 0	16,363 5 0	.....
1815-16	6714 17 6	1826 5 0	6502 0 0	9757 17 6	18,086 2 6	.....	11,371 10 0
1816-17	7536 15 0	1619 2 6	5581 10 0	.....	7200 12 6	336 2 6	.....
1817-18	11,752 12 6	2151 2 6	6276 12 6	53 5 0	8481 0 0	3271 12 6	.....
1818-19	10,119 0 0	1245 2 6	6381 10 0	31 7 6	7658 0 0	2461 0 0	.....
1819-20	20,744 0 0	1656 7 6	6195 12 6	.....	7852 0 0	12,892 0 0	.....
1820-21	7503 17 6	996 12 6	5682 15 0	.....	6679 7 6	824 10 0	.....
1821-22	14,698 15 0	1533 12 6	6588 12 6	.....	7936 0 0	6762 15 0	.....
1822-23	29,156 2 6	2283 7 6	6097 0 0	.....	8380 7 6	20,775 15 0	.....
1823-24	8376 17 6	1047 2 6	5856 17 6	.....	6904 0 0	1472 17 6	.....
1824-25	9369 17 6	1239 17 6	6068 12 6	.....	7308 10 0	2061 7 6	.....

A LIST OF BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

JOHN HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

THE REV. JOHN BIRD SUMNER'S WORKS.

SERMONS on the PRINCIPAL FESTIVALS of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH; to which are added, Three Sermons on Good FRIDAY. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* boards. *Just published.*

The EVIDENCE of CHRISTIANITY, derived from its NATURE and RECEPTION. Second Edition. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* boards. Or 12mo. 6*s.* boards.

A SERIES of SERMONS on the CHRISTIAN FAITH and CHARACTER. Sixth Edition. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* bds. Or 12mo. 6*s.* bds.

APOSTOLICAL PREACHING CONSIDERED, in an Examination of St. Paul's Epistles. Fifth Edition. 8vo. 9*s.* boards.

A TREATISE on the RECORDS of the CREATION, and on the Moral Attributes of the Creator. Third Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.* bds.

The MINISTERIAL CHARACTER of CHRIST, practically Considered. By CHARLES, LORD BISHOP OF LLANDAFF. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* bds.

HEBER'S BAMPTON LECTURES.

The PERSONALITY and OFFICE of the CHRISTIAN COMFORTER asserted and explained, in a Course of Sermons on John xvi. 7. Preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1815, at the Lectures founded by the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A. Canon of Salisbury. By REGINALD HEBER, late Lord Bishop of Calcutta. Second Edition. 8vo. 13*s.* bds.